The American
Political Science Review

VOL. XLI JUNE, 1947 NO. 3

RECENT CONSTITUTION-MAKING IN FRANCE

ROBERT K. GOOCH
University of Virginia

I

The Fourth Republic in France, which at the present fateful moment is in the early days of its uncertain career, is definitely enough established to ensure that it will forever be listed among the several régimes that have prevailed in France since the Revolution. So also, the constitution of the Fourth Republic, commonly referred to as the constitution of September 28, 1946, this being the date of its adoption by the constituent assembly that formulated it, will demand a place on the proverbially long list of constitutions of France, no matter on what basis a count may be made. This constitution was ratified by the voters on October 13, 1946.

The year 1946, it will be remembered, saw the formulation of an earlier constitution in France by an earlier constituent assembly. This constitution, once drafted, succeeded in being passed by the assembly, the First National Constituent Assembly; but the closeness of the vote (309 to 249) was merely one indication of the difficulty it encountered in securing approval.[1] The date of the adoption was April 19, 1946.[2] The constitution was rejected at the polls on May 5, being the only constitution ever to be disapproved by the French voters.

The present constitution of France and the assembly that formulated it, namely, the Second National Constituent Assembly,

[1] By comparison, the Girondin constitution of 1793, it may be recalled, failed even of passage in the Convention; whereas the Montagnard constitution (constitution of June 24, 1793), though passed in the Convention by acclamation and overwhelmingly ratified by the voters, was never put into operation.

[2] It is regularly referred to as the constitution of April 15, 1946.

cannot be intelligently studied without reference to and consideration of the earlier constitution and the earlier assembly. A first and simple illustration is to be seen in the matter of the legal basis for the two assemblies.

The First National Constituent Assembly, it will be recalled, was elected on October 21, 1945, in accordance with plans formulated in July by the de Gaulle Government and approved by the Provisional Consultative Assembly. The first question submitted to referendum at the time of the election of this First National Constituent Assembly, namely, whether the Assembly should possess constituent authority, was answered so overwhelmingly in the affirmative (over 18½ millions to less than 700,000) that controversy like that concerning the power of the Convention of 1792 and of the Bordeaux Assembly of 1871 seems unlikely ever to arise, and formalistic questions about lack of continuity with the Third Republic are afforded ready answer.

Each of the two National Constituent Assemblies of 1945–46, like all similar French assemblies, differed of course from the Philadelphia and most other American constitutional conventions in the important and interesting respect that it served as an integral part of the governmental system of France at the same time that it concerned itself with the formulation of a constitution for the nation. The legal foundation for both assemblies as governing bodies was the short act set out on the back of the ballot on October 21, 1945,[3] as the basis for the second question submitted to referendum. When this question, namely, whether government should temporarily be organized in accordance with the terms of the act, was answered in the affirmative, approval was likewise given to provisions stipulating that in the event of rejection of the constitution drawn up by the assembly, there should be immediate election of another constituent assembly and that the new assembly should possess the same powers as the old.

The act of November 2, 1945, which served as the basis of French government until the present constitution came into operation, is a document of no little interest. Its simple provisions deserve more

[3] It subsequently became the act of November 2, 1945. A convenient English translation of the text may be found in W. H. Mallory, *Political Handbook of the World, 20th Year* (New York, 1947), pp. 63–64. A careful study of the act is made by Robert Salomon in "Le Gouvernement constitutionnel institué par la loi du 2 novembre 1945," *Revue Politique et Parlementaire*, No. 554, Mar. 10, 1946.

than passing comparison with the elaborate provisions of the constitutions formulated by the two assemblies.[4] Such a comparison, it might be concluded by some students, lends weight to the French proverb about the superior soundness of what is provisional.

If the Second National Constituent Assembly succeeded in drafting a definitive constitutional text, it likewise took official cognizance of five other complete texts. With these documents, students of French constitutional history will doubtless wish to have some concern. Four of the draft texts were sponsored, respectively, by the M.R.P., the Communist party, the S.F.I.O., and the Republican Party of Liberty. The fifth was sponsored by a single deputy, M. Jacques Bardoux.[5]

II

The overwhelming majority by which, as has been seen, the French electors voted to vest constituent authority in the two assemblies of 1945–46 seems ample evidence of an almost unanimous desire on the part of the French people to have a new constitution. No little interest attaches to the fact that this desire for a new constitution involved not only a repudiation of Vichy, which is natural enough, but a repudiation as well of the constitution of the Third Republic. In the latter respect, the fact that this constitution had the longest life of any constitution which France has had since the Revolution carried little weight. Nor was any substantial support aroused for it by such considerations as that it had become

[4] Though the contrast between the short act and the two long documents is doubtless less great than that between the régime under which the Constituent Assembly of 1789 operated and the régime established by the constitution of September 3, 1791, the difference seems somewhat greater than that between the régime that was evolved in 1871–75 and the régime set up by the constitution of the Third Republic.

[5] Because of the prevailing political situation, the S.F.I.O. draft is of especial interest. The French text of the several draft constitutions, preceded by the French text of the constitution of April 15, 1946, are published in convenient form in Secrétariat d'État à la Présidence du Conseil et à l'Information, Notes Documentaires et Études, No. 209 (Série textes et documents—XXVIII), 3 août 1946, "Les Projets constitutionnels français." An English translation of the constitution of April 15, 1946, was printed in the *New York Times*, Apr. 23. So far as the present constitution is concerned, a convenient copy of the French text, together with extracts from declarations concerning it by party leaders, was published in France in a single folio by the National Press Association, and is readily available. An English translation was printed in the *New York Times*, Oct. 1. A somewhat better translation has been issued, as has also the French text, by the French Press and Information Service (501 Madison Avenue, New York 22).

adapted to French needs and the French character, that under it the First World War was successfully fought to a conclusion, and that it was the basis of the régime which the enemies of political democracy in France so greatly hated. The simple and sufficient explanation seems to be that the French people associate the constitution of the Third Republic with the disastrous defeat of the French armies by the Nazis in 1940, however unreasoning and in most respects unreasonable this attitude may be.[6]

With the almost unanimous desire in France for a new constitution is to be contrasted the fact that the constitution of April 15, 1946, was rejected by the voters and that the constitution of September 28, 1946, was ratified by a far from impressive vote.[7] There was, it seems manifest, no marked agreement concerning what kind of constitution was desired.[8] In this respect, there came into play the many controversial complexities and vagaries that give to practical French politics their peculiar fascination for the interested student.[9] But underneath the complex and confusing details, and of course interrelated with them, there ran deep an issue between Left and Right that from a constitutional point of view is susceptible of reasonably simple formulation.

Importance attaches to recalling that the régime of the Third Republic in France was the first example in history of a system of government that was at the same time parliamentary and nonmonarchical. Historically and originally, parliamentary govern-

[6] Brief but interesting comment on the matter is made by André Géraud (Pertinax) in "The New French Constitution," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 25, No. 3, Apr. 1947.

[7] The unfavorable majority in respect of the first constitution was approximately a million and a half. The percentages against and for were approximately 53 and 47. The favorable majority in respect of the second constitution was approximately a million. The approximate percentages were the reverse of those in May.

[8] This would again seem to be connected with the irrational attitude toward the constitution of 1875, which in reality incorporated the only basic principles acceptable to the French people. Cf., in this respect, D. M. P., "French Parties and the Constitution," *The World Today*, Vol. 2, No. 10 (New Series), Oct., 1946.

[9] The French daily press, of course, offers the best documentation in these respects. On the whole, *Le Monde* seems the best single paper through which to follow developments. However, the several organs of the leading parties are, taken together, an invaluable source. French, English, and American magazines and reviews offer certain helpful material. Especial reference may be made to two essays in English: "The Launching of the Fourth French Republic," by Charles A. Micaud, in *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 8, No. 3, Aug., 1946; and "Political Change in France and Italy," by Mario Einaudi, in this REVIEW, Vol. 40, No. 5, Oct., 1946.

ment was, of course, the means by which reconciliation was effected between monarchy and political democracy. However, in France, as is well known, by the time political democracy had become well established, monarchy had come to have, in prevailing sentiment, such special associations that monarchy could no longer be reconciled with political democracy. On the other hand, parliamentary government became inextricably connected in the popular mind with political democracy. The result was the familiar fact that republicanism, political democracy, and parliamentary government came in France to be largely identical and interchangeable concepts. In these circumstances, the French variant of parliamentary government experienced a development during the Third Republic that took place in the presence of two opposing tendencies. A tendency for the characteristics of the parliamentary system in its classic form to survive in France was modified in a "republican" direction towards a régime in which Parliament tended to become all-powerful. It may be said that the issue of strong versus weak executive was involved. No undue over-simplification would seem to be involved in the suggestion that the postwar constitutional history of France has been, at bottom, characterized by the same opposing tendencies and the same issue. Little more than a casual study of French political controversy in the postwar period is necessary in order to find abundant evidence of the Left's support of and the Right's hostility to what has long been called in France the *régime conventionnel*, and what was frequently referred to in the two assemblies of 1945–46 as *gouvernement d'assemblée*. By the same token, Left and Right reversed their attitudes of support and hostility with respect to proposals calculated to strengthen the executive.[10]

It should be remembered that the question whether government should temporarily be organized in accordance with the terms of what came to be known as the act of November 2, 1945, was on October 21, 1945, less overwhelmingly approved (about 12¾ to 6½

[10] Pertinax stresses (*loc. cit.*) the fear that the Left felt of "presidential government." In this respect, the Left would seem to reflect the general attitude of the people. Closely interconnected is the fact that the Left, in spite of its somewhat extreme emphasis, defends the parliamentary system as such. Thus, when in the Second National Constituent Assembly a proposal was made to adopt a system like the American, based on the separation of legislature and executive, both Socialist and Communist leaders intervened to declare the parliamentary régime indispensable. *Journal Officiel*, Sept. 6, 1946, p. 3551.

millions) than the question concerning constituent authority for the assembly. It is not surprising that at this early moment considerations of practical politics began to manifest themselves. The act of November 2, 1945, was disliked by the principal elements of the Left. Sponsorship by General de Gaulle was doubtless an important consideration; but even opposition of this kind was probably not wholly a matter of politics in the narrowest sense. The position of the General and the basic character of the act appeared to the principal elements of the Left to be causally interconnected. Both were regarded as literally reactionary in terms of traditional French development of the relationship between the executive and the legislature. On the other hand, the Left, as was no doubt natural, was from the beginning accused by its opponents of stultifying, in accordance with its own pattern, the act that it had unsuccessfully opposed at the time of the referendum. So far as the constitution of April 15, 1946, is concerned, there is no doubt but that its most striking provisions implied a system of government that, while parliamentary in form, would have approached a régime of an omnipotent assembly much nearer than was ever the case under the Third Republic. Thus, M. Coste-Floret, General Reporter for the Committee on the Constitution in the Second National Constituent Assembly, asserted in his report that "one of the reasons for which the nation rejected the draft of April 19 by more than a million votes is, rightly or wrongly, its conviction that this text instituted *gouvernement d'assemblée*." The provisions of the present constitution clearly represent some swing back from this extreme, however slight it may in principle appear to students of the subject, and however it may turn out in practice to be.

It is, of course, impossible to know the extent to which the French voters, in manifesting a decided swing to the left in 1945 in choosing the members of the First National Constituent Assembly, displayed the well-known French affectation of proving how *avancés* they are by voting further left than they feel. Certainly, the result, namely, that the assembly was somewhat further left than the country itself, had far-reaching effects. The political consequences, including ultimately the elimination of General de Gaulle, will doubtless be for many years occasion for the kind of controversy that gives to French politics the peculiar interest to which reference has been made above. As has been suggested, these

consequences were, though indirectly, interconnected with the constitutional problem. The same thing is, of course, true of subsequent events. Political interpretations of rejection by the voters of the first constitution, political manoeuvres in anticipation of the election of the Second National Constituent Assembly, the results of the elections, and the character of prevailing government under the second assembly are all basic considerations against which to view the constitutional problem. In general, the Socialists, in spite of their numerical inferiority in the big three, held, not only from a political but also from a constitutional point of view, a key position in both assemblies of 1945–46. Thus, just as the Communists in the Communist-Socialist majority of the first assembly were so dependent on the Socialists that the latter could largely insist on their constitutional views, so in the second assembly the M.R.P. was similarly dependent. In this last respect, an interesting manifestation was to be seen in the fact that, whereas M. Coste-Floret, General Reporter of the Committee on the Constitution, was a member of the M.R.P., the president of the Committee was the well-known Socialist, M. André Philip, who has been called the Father of the Constitution.

From a strictly constitutional point of view, a summary of the development is susceptible of simple formulation, even though some of the questions involved cannot be answered with accurate certainty. The overwhelming mass of the French people desired a new constitution. The voters chose, for the purpose of framing this constitution, an assembly in which the constitution actually drawn up was approved only by the far Left.[11] This Left, at the time of its election, could not persuade a majority of the voters to pronounce against the temporary system of government which was proposed on the ballot and which was disliked by it. The constitution which it formulated itself, on what it regarded as sounder principles than those underlying the temporary system, was rejected by the voters. These voters subsequently elected a second assembly, with an axis slightly further to the right. The degree of difference was roughly the same as that of the variations between the provisions of the

[11] The 249 members of the assembly who voted against acceptance of the constitution were distributed as follows: 144 M.R.P.; 22 Résistance dém. et socialiste; 36 Républicains de la Liberté; 22 Radicaux et rad. soc.; 8 Groupe paysan; 15 Républicains ind.; 2 (Giraudoux, Marin) no group.

constitution formulated by the second assembly[12] and the provisions of the first constitution. The second constitution proved acceptable to a majority of the voters.

III

The characteristic features of the parliamentary régime in its classic form involve subtleties that are difficult, if not impossible, to reduce to written constitutional form. Convention supplements law at so many points that differences between practice and principle tend to elude the possibility of formulation. The ideal of a nice balance between executive and legislature may, in the actual operation of particular régimes, give way to deviations from perfect equilibrium which are relatively so great that political tradition and political habits are of more far-reaching importance than constitutional provisions. In view of these simple considerations, it is not strange that in the two French National Constituent Assemblies of 1945–46 opposing tendencies manifested themselves in constitutional matters less with respect to the central issue itself than with respect to two matters which are commonly regarded as not in principle basic to the central issue. These two matters were the question of the formal structure of the legislature and the question of the position of the formal head of the state.

IV

Although a unicameral legislature is in principle perfectly consistent with parliamentary government—the system in its classic form indeed demanding that ministerial responsibility shall be primarily to one chamber[13]—nevertheless it is not difficult to understand that unicameralism versus bicameralism was considered a basic issue by the two National Constituent Assemblies of 1945–46 and by the country. In the first assembly, the Socialists, who remembered M. Blum's experience with the Senate in Popular Front days, were joined in the matter by the Communists, though the latter, as they were on occasion pointedly reminded,[14] could

[12] At the time of its adoption, it was disapproved by 106 (composed primarily of Radicals and of elements of the Right, including the supporters of General de Gaulle) out of 546 taking part in the vote. Cf. *J. O.*, Sept. 29, 1946, pp. 4259–4260.

[13] The present constitution asserts (Art. 48) not only that the ministers shall be responsible to one house, but also that "they shall not be responsible" to the other.

[14] For an interesting speech in this respect from the Communist side by M. Fajon during debate in the Second National Constituent Assembly and for a telling intervention by M. Herriot, cf. *J. O.*, Sept. 12, 1946, pp. 3648, 3650.

scarcely invoke in this respect their favorite example of Soviet Russia. These allies refused to compromise in the matter, naturally recalling, and with considerable historical accuracy, that French republican tradition demanded a single national assembly. In any event, the constitution of April 15, 1946, employed the expression, "The Sovereignty of the National Assembly," as the title of the initial section (Arts. 40–61) of the main body of its provisions; and, although meticulous formal juristic argument might make a case against the accuracy of the expression,[15] employment of the rubric is not without significance. In a formal way, it reflected the practical fact of the preponderant position intended to be bestowed upon the proposed National Assembly. Thus, generally speaking, most of the members of the First National Constituent Assembly other than the Socialists and Communists saw in unicameralism the principal manifestation of the "legislative omnipotence" to which they were unalterably opposed. The two largely powerless advisory bodies that in appearance represented some modification of the unicameral principle, the Council of the French Union (Arts. 71–75) and the Economic Council (Arts. 63–64) could scarcely be seriously contended to be a potential check on the National Assembly. M. Herriot referred to them as "useless" and as "incumbrances." And from this he proceeded to state the essence of his case against the first constitution. "The single assembly," he asserted, "will absorb the executive as well." This position of the leader of the once powerful Radical party is not without interest. The party, claiming with some justice to be the traditional and typical republican party and the real heir of the French Revolution, asserted more than once during the Third Republic that the *régime conventionnel* represented its ideal. However, the Senate, from being reluctantly accepted by Gambetta and the Radicals in the beginning as the necessary price of a republic, came to be a not unimportant seat of their power; and Radical ideology was obliged to associate with Parliament its preference for subordination of the executive to an assembly. If M. Herriot's concern for the executive[16] reflected the attitude of the two dozen Radical members of the First National Constituent Assembly, the new position, which was in general maintained in the Second National Constituent

[15] Sovereignty is twice (Arts. 43, 47) asserted to rest with the "people"; and final voice in the matter of amendment (Art. 123) is given to the voters.

[16] He might, of course, have invoked the example of the great Radical, Clemenceau.

Assembly, was doubtless to be explained in terms of complex party tactics.

After the defeat by the voters of the constitution of April 15, 1946, one common interpretation of the event was to see in it a popular expression of preference for a bicameral legislature. Even the Communists stated in the beginning that they subscribed to this interpretation, in spite of the fact that they had earlier asserted that no compromise with bicameralism was possible. As a consequence, establishment of a bicameral parliament seemed henceforth a foregone conclusion. In this respect, an outside observer might wonder whether the Parliament of the Third Republic, which had enjoyed much the longest life of any modern French assembly, might not be as good an example as was likely to be found. This seems on the whole to have been the persistent view of the Radicals. On the other hand, the body of the French people appear to have associated it with France's "disgrace," and this somewhat curious philosophy left the problem by no means easy to solve. In this context, the original position of the Communists, as stated for example on April 19, 1946, by M. Jacques Duclos, was no doubt politically sound. In the voting on October 21, 1945, the country, he asserted, "condemned the régime of 1875," concluding simply "and hence the Senate."

The Second National Constituent Assembly introduced into the terms of the present constitution a solution determined by the considerations that have been set out. The title of the first section of the main body of the constitution is no longer "The Sovereignty of the National Assembly," but merely "Sovereignty." However, the difference in terminology seems somewhat more formal than real. The present constitution states (Art. 3) that "national sovereignty belongs to the French people," an assertion contained as a matter of fact in the constitution of April 15, 1946; but the present constitution, after speaking of the exercise of sovereignty by the people in constitutional matters, stipulates that "in all other matters they shall exercise it through their deputies in the National Assembly elected by universal, equal, direct, and secret suffrage." No one of the draft texts before the Second National Constituent Assembly went so far as to suggest the expression, "Sovereignty of the National Assembly"; and all assert either that sovereignty belongs to the people or to the nation. The Communist text, in spite of the party's apparent acceptance of bicameralism, associates no other

body with the National Assembly, the latter being called (Art. 6) "the supreme organ of the Republic." The Socialists paid only superficial service to the principle of bicameralism, their draft proposing an article (Art. 49) to the effect that "Parliament shall consist of the National Assembly and of the Council of the French Union." The latter body, it will be remembered, was one of those asserted by M. Herriot in the first assembly to be "useless" and an "incumbrance"; and it was from the Socialist text (Art. 46) that was taken the provision of the present constitution, already noted, that the French people exercise their sovereignty, other than in constitutional matters, through the National Assembly. The present constitution, while retaining (Art. 25) the Economic Council[17] and (Arts. 63–72) the Council of the Union,[18] associates with the National Assembly to form Parliament a body known as the Council of the Republic. This second chamber was provided for in the text both of the M.R.P. (Arts. 38 et seq.) and of the Republican Party of Liberty (Arts. 40 et seq.); so that to this extent it has rightist associations. However, those two texts proposed for the Council of the Republic a subordination to the other chamber much greater than that of the Senate to the Chamber of Deputies under the Third Republic; and the provisions concerning the Council of the Republic which were incorporated into the present constitution give the Council a position that on the whole is not greatly different from the position envisaged in the texts of the M.R.P. and the Republican Party of Liberty. In general, the Council of the Republic, which is indirectly chosen (Art. 6), has considerable freedom to engage in debate of, and to suggest amendments to, measures passed by the National Assembly (Arts. 14, 20); but it has only subordinate power of initiation, and, in accordance with the provision (Art. 13) that "the National Assembly alone shall vote laws," it has no final authority.

[17] For adoption by the Second National Constituent Assembly of the special statute required to determine the organization of the Council, see *J. O.*, Oct. 3, 1946, p. 4399.

[18] The name is changed from Council to Assembly. For adoption by the Second National Constituent Assembly of the special statute required to determine the structure and composition of the Assembly, see *J. O.*, Oct. 3, 1946, pp. 4391–4393. Title VIII (*De l'Union française*), containing Arts. 60–82, is much the longest title of the present constitution. This is doubtless a reflection of French concern for the imperial problem. Special students of the subject find the improvement in this respect the principal mark of superiority of the present constitution over the earlier.

M. Coste-Floret has suggested that the legislative system established for the Fourth Republic is one of "*monocaméralisme tempéré.*" A Radical speaker asserted with some reason during debate that support of bicameralism by the Committee on the Constitution was pure pretence, since its members declared their support of two chambers only to argue throughout on the hypothesis of unicameralism. In the course of the debate, the Council of the Republic came to be called by its supporters a *chambre de réflexion.* M. André Géraud (Pertinax) asserts[19] that this "is probably to say the best thing possible about its function."

V

A second essentially formal constitutional question that was elevated from the beginning into an issue in postwar France is the question of the position of the President of the Republic. In the First National Constituent Assembly, the Socialists and Communists, invoking the views of Clemenceau, declared themselves opposed to establishment of the office. This attitude would not seem to be a particularly extreme one; for a parliamentary system can in principle exist without a formal head of state. The Socialists and Communists in the first assembly not very convincingly insisted that their acceptance of the President of the Republic was evidence of their willingness to compromise in order to meet the constitutional views of other deputies. The remainder of the assembly not unnaturally found this insufficient. It is impossible to estimate how many of the members who favored a stronger executive held the confused view that, under a parliamentary system, the executive will be strengthened if a certain amount of real power is vested in the head of the state. However that may be, the Left, out of regard for this view, or for some other reason, established a position that received, and doubtless deserved, M. Herriot's soft ridicule. Neither the provisions of the Constitution of April 15, 1946, nor those of the constitution of September 28, 1946, follow the constitution of the Third Republic and numerous other European constitutions constructed on the parliamentary model, which vest in the head of the state all powers commonly regarded as executive in character, with the assurance that they will be exercised only by responsible ministers. Instead, such powers, curi-

[19] *Loc. cit.*

ously enough, are distributed between the President of the Republic and the prime minister. For example, the duty of law enforcement is by both constitutions imposed[20] on the prime minister; but command of the armed forces is vested[21] in the President of the Republic, who is given[22] the duty of promulgating laws and authority to sign decrees for their execution. Similarly, the prime minister shares with the National Assembly the initiation of legislation,[23] a power normally vested in the head of the state; and the general power of appointment is given[24] to the prime minister rather than to the President of the Republic. In these respects, the interesting argument of the Committee on the Constitution in the Second National Constituent Assembly was that departure from tradition necessarily resulted from establishment in the constitution of the position of prime minister, the constitution of the Third Republic being consequently no guide in the matter. Contentions in favor of the more logical arrangement in the constitution of 1875 were brushed aside with the assertion that "something new and reasonable" was required.

So far as choice of the prime minister himself is concerned, the Left in the First National Constituent Assembly declared itself unalterably opposed to appointment by the President; but the constitution of September 28, 1946, stipulates (Art. 45) that the choice shall belong to the President of the Republic. According to the terms (Arts. 76, 94) of the earlier constitution, the head of the government was to be chosen by the National Assembly itself from among names submitted to it, after the usual consultation, by the President of the Republic. The provisions of the present constitution (Arts. 45–46) are so elaborate that the power of choice given the President is deprived of real substance. More specifically, the President, at the beginning of a legislature and in the case of vacancy at other times, must choose the prime minister; but the

[20] Const. April 15, Art 78; Const. Sept. 28, Art. 47.

[21] Const. April 15, Art. 98; Const. Sept. 28, Art. 33. However, certain new provisions of the present constitution explicitly associate the prime minister and cabinet with the *direction* of military affairs.

[22] Const. April 15, Art. 102; Const. Sept. 28, Art. 36. However, in the present constitution the decree-making authority is not made explicit as in the first constitution.

[23] Const. April 15, Art. 62; Const. Sept. 28, Art. 14.

[24] Const. April 15, Art. 78; Const. Sept. 28, Art. 47. There are a few exceptions, stipulated in specific provisions.

latter must present himself, together with a statement of his policy, to the National Assembly for approval by a deliberate vote, whereupon he and the members he chooses for his cabinet receive formal appointment through decree of the President of the Republic. M. Herriot, in a series of interventions in debate, bitterly criticized the extra step involved in the requirement that the prime minister present himself alone to the National Assembly before naming his ministers; but he was not able to move the Committee on the Constitution or the assembly.

According to the terms of both constitutions of 1946, many ceremonial functions are to be performed by the President of the Republic. However, any distinction between formal and real power is rendered largely meaningless by the familiar stipulation[25] that the President is responsible only in case of high treason and that all of his acts require countersignature by the prime minister and another minister.[26] M. Ramadier, the present French prime minister, asserted during debate in the Second National Constituent Assembly that the matter of the President's powers is of little importance. He appeared to receive general approbation when he characterized the position as one involving "not definite power but moral authority."

Two interesting stipulations in both constitutions of 1946[27] are calculated to increase ministerial stability. In practically identical terms contained in the two documents, it is provided that a vote of lack of confidence or a vote of censure can be given only in accordance with a highly deliberate procedure. The question of confidence can be put only by the prime minister, and then only after a decision in the cabinet. In this case and in the case of a motion of censure, a vote in the National Assembly, which must be by roll-call, can be taken only after the lapse of a whole day.[28] A vote of confidence can be defeated, and a vote of censure carried, only by a majority of the whole membership. In the event of such majority, "collective resignation of the cabinet" is mandatory. Thus, the sanction for political responsibility is made explicit, this being in addition to the general declaration,[29] after the manner of the con-

[25] Const. April 15, Art. 107; Const. Sept. 28, Art. 42.
[26] Const. April 15, Art. 103; Const. Sept. 28, Art. 38.
[27] Const. April 15, Arts. 81, 82; Const. Sept. 28, Arts. 49, 50.
[28] The constitution of April 15 would have required a delay of two days.
[29] Const. April 15, Art. 80; Const. Sept. 28, Art. 48.

stitution of the Third Republic, that the ministers are collectively and individually responsible to the National Assembly. It may be noted that in all this there is, interestingly enough, fairly close resemblance to the provisions (Art I) of the act of July 2, 1945. The president of the Committee on the Constitution in the Second National Constituent Assembly, M. André Philip, did not hesitate to assert in debate that the old form of ministerial instability is "completely eliminated from now on."[30]

On the other hand, the possibility of the dissolution of the National Assembly,[31] perhaps the most important power of a parliamentary executive, is so hedged about as to bear little resemblance to the classic form of this feature. The constitution of September 28, 1946, dropped a provision of the constitution of April 15, 1946, whereby the National Assembly could by a two-thirds vote dissolve itself; but otherwise the provisions of the two constitutions with respect to the power differ only in detail. So far as the stipulations of the present constitution are concerned, no dissolution at all is possible within a period of eighteen months dating from the beginning of a given Parliament. Subsequently, dissolution is possible only if, within a given period of eighteen months, two ministerial crises occur occasioned either by a vote of lack of confidence or by a vote of censure. If the conditions necessary for a dissolution come to exist, decision in the matter lies with the prime minister and cabinet. Previous consultation of the President of the National Assembly is required.[32]

French opposition to the traditional power of dissolution is an interesting phenomenon. Nowhere can better academic accounts of the nature of the institution be found than in France. Its essentially democratic character, involving as it does consultation of the voters, is in principle recognized. At the same time, fear of its abuse in practice is not infrequently voiced. The one dissolution of

[30] Such an assertion is based largely on the assumption that the majority in the National Assembly will consist of a few large well-disciplined parties. This, in turn, is connected with the much discussed prevailing electoral law and the variant of proportional representation established by it.

[31] Const. April 15, Arts. 83, 84; Const. Sept. 28, Art. 51.

[32] In the event of dissolution, it is provided (Art. 52) that current business shall be carried on by the cabinet, with the interesting and important exceptions that the President of the National Assembly shall serve as prime minister and that he shall, with the approval of the other officers of the National Assembly, appoint a new minister of the interior.

the Chamber of Deputies under the Third Republic, that by MacMahon in 1877, is invoked as a warning of possible employment of the power with a view to a *coup d'état;* and this consideration prevailed when Doumergue, following the 1934 crisis, attempted to secure amendment of the constitution of 1875. A speaker in the Second National Constituent Assembly was at bottom probably not far wrong when he asserted that the majority would not accept dissolution in its classic form because it is "in manifest contradiction with the principles of *gouvernement d'assemblée.*"

Finally, the most striking respect in which the two constitutions of 1946 differ from the act of July 2, 1945, is in the matter of finance. Whereas the act (Art. V) deprived the constituent assemblies of initiative with respect to the budget,[33] the constitutions expressly give[34] the initiative, in the matter of expenditure, to members of the National Assembly. In this respect, the present constitution has realized some improvement over the constitution of April 15, 1946, through incorporation of a new provision (in Art. 17) that "no proposals which would tend to increase expenditures already decided upon or create new ones may be presented during discussion of the budget or of prospective or supplementary appropriations." M. Reynaud, invoking the practice and experience of the House of Commons in England, undertook in the Second National Constituent Assembly a sustained, but in the end unsuccessful, effort to confine financial initiative to the executive.

VI

The various articles of the two constitutions of 1946 in both cases exceed a hundred in number.[35] They naturally deal with a number of matters that are highly interesting, even though not directly connected with the central problem of the régime.

The student who feels a special interest in bills of rights and similar phenomena may find in the postwar history of France a great abundance of material for study. The constitution of April 15, 1946, contains a long initial section entitled "Declaration of the

[33] Cf., in this respect, Robert Jacomet, "L'Assemblée constituante et le budget," *Rev. Pol. et Parl.*, No. 555, Apr. 10, 1946.

[34] Const. April 15, Art. 69; Const. Sept. 28, Art. 17.

[35] The respective numbers are 134 and 106. Inasmuch as the first constitution numbers the provisions in the declaration of rights, the second constitution actually contains the greater number of articles.

Rights of Man." This consists of a brief preamble, followed by thirty-nine articles, falling into two approximately equal parts, headed respectively "Liberties" and "Social and Economic Rights." These elaborate articles include, often verbatim, some of the principal provisions of the famous Declaration of 1789; but, as might be expected, there are some significant omissions.[36] The remainder of the section is in general made up of certain modern refinements of traditional political rights and certain modern declarations with respect to social and economic matters. Four of the five draft constitutions introduced into the Second National Constituent Assembly contain elaborate initial sections concerned with rights and their declaration. The Communist draft confines itself to listing concisely in an early article (Art. 4) some fifteen subjects of legal guarantees. The assembly, after a debate that was long, sometimes bitter, and in some respects sterile, agreed on a short "preamble" for the present constitution. The brevity of this initial section is made possible by a mere reaffirmation of the rights of the Declaration of 1789 together with "the fundamental principles recognized by the laws of the Republic," to which is added a proclamation of a few political, economic, and social principles, "as particularly necessary in our time." In the context of this last phrase, special note may be made of a declaration of enlightened colonial policy and of a statement that "on condition of reciprocity France consents to the limitations of sovereignty necessary to the organization and defense of peace."

The amending process, as arranged in the constitution of April 15, 1946, would have involved a somewhat elaborate method of proposal at the hands of the National Assembly, followed by ratification by national referendum. The procedure defined (Art. 90) in the provisions of the present constitution is somewhat more complex. Proposal follows essentially similar lines, except that the Council of the Republic may participate; but an alternative to ratification by national referendum is arranged in the form of approval of a proposal in the National Assembly by a two-thirds vote or in both houses by a three-fifths vote.

Passing notice may be taken of a new institution stipulated for (Arts. 91–93) in the provisions of the present constitution. It is

[36] Opponents of the constitution of April 15, 1946, interpreted its rejection as in part due to its failure to go as far as the Declaration of 1789 in recognizing the rights of private property.

known as the Constitutional Committee. This body, composed of the presidents of the two houses of Parliament and of members chosen by the two houses from outside their own membership, meets under the chairmanship of the President of the Republic. Its general function is to consider whether acts of the National Assembly are in conflict with the terms of the constitution. The Committee is to act at the joint request of the President of the Republic and the Council of the Republic. In such a case, the primary duty of the Committee is to seek to secure agreement between the two houses of Parliament. In case of failure in this effort, it must decide without delay whether it conceives that a conflict with the constitution exists. If its decision is affirmative, the act in question cannot be promulgated; and the only positive action left to Parliament is to put the amending process into operation. Only time can tell how effective this novel institution will be.

VII

The constitution of April 15, 1946, cannot be said to have been a document possessed of no merit. Whether its provisions would have been rejected by the French voters if the constitution had not been sponsored by the Communists is at least doubtful. The present constitution seems on the whole a slightly better document. The General Reporter for the Committee on the Constitution in the First National Constituent Assembly, the former Radical, M. Pierre Cot,[37] maintained to the end that the earlier constitution would not have established a *régime conventionnel*. If this is true, then the present constitution will not establish such a system. The matter is in part one of definition. On the other hand, there can be little doubt but that the Left hopes and intends that the present government of France shall develop into a close approximation to such a régime. From a purely constitutional point of view, possibly a majority of the French people instinctively approve such a system. In a situation where the constitutional problem and political vagaries are inextricably intertwined, it is platitudinous to conclude that the future is highly uncertain.

[37] An earlier General Reporter, M. de Menthon, a member of the M.R.P. had withdrawn in March in the face of Socialist-Communist solidarity.

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

THE TERM OF OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

EVERETT S. BROWN
University of Michigan

On March 21, 1947, the House of Representatives concurred in the Senate amendments to House Joint Resolution 27, which proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States placing a limit on the number of terms a President may serve.[1] The vote in the House on so important a question was amazingly small—81 ayes, 29 noes, a total of 110 votes. Objection to the vote on the ground of absence of a quorum was made and then withdrawn. The necessary vote of two-thirds was declared to have been taken, and the way was cleared for possible ratification by the legislatures of the states.

The pertinent part of the proposed amendment in its final form is as follows:

> "No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of the President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term."[2]

Under this amendment a President might conceivably serve not to exceed ten years. The primary object of the latter part of the complicated proposal was to except President Truman from its application. In order to be valid, the proposal must be ratified within a period of seven years after its submission to the states.

The main debate in the House, where the resolution originated, was confined to a single day, February 6.[3] Democrats complained bitterly of the short time permitted for general debate, but were over-ruled by the Republican majority, which stood solidly behind the resolution. A considerable amount of the discussion was devoted to quotations from statements made by former Presidents and other prominent persons advocating a limitation on the President's tenure, and to other quotations warning of the danger of closing the door to experienced men in time of possible new emergencies.

To the assertion that what was really being proposed was to let the

[1] *Cong. Rec.*, Mar. 21, 1947, p. 2471.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 2467–2468.
[3] *Ibid.*, Feb. 6, pp. 886–915.

people decide whether or not the limitation should be written into the constitution, it was replied that the present generation had no right to bind future generations, and that the Constitution should be kept as free as possible from inflexible provisions. It was argued further that a decision by state legislatures would not be a true test of the wishes of the people, since state legislators would not be elected on this issue alone but on diverse state matters. In this connection, Representative Colmer offered an amendment providing that ratification be by conventions in the states, rather than by state legislatures as provided in the original joint resolution. Defeat of this proposal was foreseen in the request of Mr. Michener for unanimous consent that all debate on it should close in ten minutes.[4] How little the members of the House had acquainted themselves with the convention method of ratification was disclosed by Mr. O'Hara's inquiry of Mr. Colmer if it was not true that the Eighteenth Amendment had been submitted to conventions, and Mr. Colmer's reply that such was his understanding.[5] Mr. Colmer's amendment was rejected by a vote of 74 ayes to 134 noes, and the resolution in its original form was then passed—yeas 285, nays 131, not voting 26—and sent to the Senate.[6]

The proposal emerged from the Senate Judiciary Committee with certain amendments, one of which provided for ratification by state conventions.[7] This led to further discussion of the relative merits of the two possible methods of ratification, and it was evident that the senators, like the members of the House, had not made a careful study of the history of the ratification of the Twenty-first Amendment. Had they done so, they would have been better prepared to answer various questions on the convention method which were asked during the debate.[8] Senator Revercomb inquired of Senator Wiley, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, who had reported the measure, whether or not it was incumbent upon the Senate to set up the machinery for holding conventions, or whether that must be left to the states. Senator Wiley replied that in his opinion the states would act without further direction from Congress. Senator Barkley supported the stand taken by Senator Wiley, adding that this was the procedure followed in connection with the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment.[9]

Senator Revercomb then asked if it were not a fact that in some in-

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 913.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 914. Of course it was not the Eighteenth, but the Twenty-first, Amendment which was submitted to conventions.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 915. [7] *Ibid.*, Mar. 5, p. 1744.

[8] On this subject, see Everett S. Brown, "Ratification of the Twenty-first Amendment," in this REVIEW, Vol. XXIX (1935), pp. 1006–17; also Everett S. Brown, *Ratification of the Twenty-first Amendment to the Constitution* (Ann Arbor, 1938), and L. B. Orfield, *The Amending of the Federal Constitution* (Ann Arbor, 1942). [9] *Cong. Rec.*, Mar. 7, pp. 1865–1866.

stances state legislatures had resolved themselves into conventions, even though their members had been elected as members of the legislature. Senator Barkley said he would not be able to answer without further inquiry.[10] He had no doubt, however, that it would be possible for a legislature to provide for a convention composed of its own members. While sitting as a convention, it would not be acting as a legislature.[11] Exception to this interpretation of the power of the legislature was taken by Senator Lucas, who declared that the legislature of his state (Illinois) would not dare, under the laws of the state, or under the Constitution of the United States, to attempt to sit as a convention. In his opinion, it was mandatory that the legislature call a convention.[12] Senator Barkley shifted his stand when he was asked by Senator Donnell if he did not believe that there was great doubt as to the right of a legislature to resolve itself into a convention. His reply was that "if a legislature attempted to do so, it would nullify the action of the Congress in declaring that conventions should be called." Senator Donnell endorsed this statement and asserted that such action by the legislature would circumvent the clear distinction presented by Article V of the Constitution between ratification by legislatures and ratification by conventions.[13]

Senator Revercomb was not yet satisfied with this statement of the case. If it were conceded that the state legislatures had the power to set up the machinery of holding a convention—to fix the method of selection of the delegates and the units of territory which they were to represent—what, he asked, was to prevent them from saying its members should be the delegates to the convention. Senator Donnell, in replying, first quoted Article VI of the Constitution, establishing the Constitution and laws passed in pursuance of it as the supreme law of the land, and then referred once more to Article V. If that article could be construed to authorize the legislatures to constitute themselves as conventions, then, he again argued, it was within their power to ignore the very distinction drawn by the Constitution.

Senator Revercomb wanted to know if it would be a violation of the provisions of the Constitution if persons running for election to the legislature should advocate the course above outlined, and these same persons should be selected as delegates to a convention and also as members constituting the legislature. Senator Donnell's reply was that there would be no violation, provided the electorate of the state were privileged to vote for the individuals both as members of the legislature and as members of the convention; otherwise, his interpretation of the question remained as already stated.[14]

[10] No such procedure actually took place during the ratification of the Twenty-first Amendment. [11] *Cong. Rec.*, Mar. 7, p. 1866.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 1867. [13] *Ibid.*, p. 1869. [14] *Ibid.*, p. 1871.

Senator Connally not only supported Senator Donnell, but suggested that if a state legislature should assume to convert itself into a convention, the federal government could reject its action and refuse to count its vote. Senator Barkley appeared now to be completely converted to Senator Donnell's point of view, for he said that if such legislative action could take place in one state it could take place in all forty-eight, which would go to the validity of all of them in ratifying, if they did ratify.[15]

To anyone following the Senate debate on House Joint Resolution 27, it became quite evident that the Judiciary Committee's amendment to provide for ratification by conventions in the states stood little chance of being accepted. In the vote on the amendment, only 20 senators supported it, while 63 opposed it, and 12 abstained from voting.[16]

Considerable time in the debate in the Senate was devoted to discussion of proposed amendments relating to the exact number of years any President might serve; but these were merely matters of detail. The fundamental question was that of setting a definite limit and, in the words of Senator Revercomb, of establishing "a safeguard and bulwark against a possible seizure of Executive direction in this great country of ours." Congress was not a sufficient check upon the innate powers of the presidential office, which can be "mushroomed fast or gradually grown until the strength of thorough despotism may be in the hands of one man." Such a situation would be a move toward the creation of dictatorship.[17]

In referring to Senator Revercomb's statement, Senator Kilgore repeated the charge, made earlier in the debate, that the proposed limitation was apparently based on fear of the people of the United States, who had the final vote as to whether a President should continue to hold the office to which he had previously been elected. He quoted with approval the following statement by the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge: "The protection of the country against caesarism or a dictatorship or a perpetual President rests in the character of the American people. No paper restriction can protect us against that. If we should reach the point where the people were ready to have a perpetual President or dictator, no constitutional provision would stand in the way."[18]

Senator Lucas declared that there would never be a dictatorship in this country as long as we have free elections. To deny the people a free choice in the election of President for a third or fourth term, he characterized as a limitation on their sovereignty which in an emergency might lead to a dictatorship, because in time of great danger an experienced Executive could well prevail over respect for the Constitution. He said that he had

[15] *Ibid.* The comparatively long report on this part of the Senate debate appears justified for the reason that this phase of constitutional interpretation was here discussed fully for the first time.

[16] *Cong. Rec.*, Mar. 10, p. 1928.

[17] *Ibid.*, Mar. 12, p. 2036.

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 2036–2037.

always understood that a true democracy overlooked no opportunity to expand the rights of the people, whereas the proposed amendment violated that fundamental concept. In support of his contention, he quoted from an article by Senator Vandenberg in 1939 in which the latter wrote that decisions over presidential tenure "should be left to the patriotic and vigilant American conscience."[19]

As the Senate debate drew toward a close, several senators proposed other amendments relating to tenure and election of the President. A proposal by Senator Langer provided for abolition of the Electoral College and substitution of nominating primaries and popular elections.[20] The proposal was defeated, as was another, offered by Senator O'Daniel, fixing as a limit of tenure a single term of six years. The only vote in its favor was cast by the Senator himself.[21]

Senator Green took occasion to call attention to a number of other questions relating to the presidency on which he thought Congress ought to take action. Should the President and Vice President continue to be elected by the Electoral College, and if so, should its members be legally bound to vote in accordance with their instructions? Should provision be made for a situation where, before the choice of electors, or after such choice but before the election of President and Vice President, a candidate for the presidency or vice presidency should die, decline to run, or be found ineligible to take office if elected? Should provision be made for the case of the death of any of the individuals from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon it, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon it? Should provision be made for a case where, after election, the President-elect, or Vice President-elect, or both, should die, decline to serve, or fail to qualify? How shall the inability of the President, or individual acting as President, be determined? Should provision be made for an individual to execute the office of President in case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, including provision for selecting such an individual? Are there, or should there be, any differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President and any other individual executing the office of President?

Senator Green said that these questions had been under consideration since 1792, and while solutions to some of them had been found in part, solutions to all ought to be found. But his proposal that action on House Joint Resolution 27 be delayed until a report on the questions he had

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 2047–2049. [20] *Ibid.*, pp. 2050–2052.

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 2053–2054. Senator O'Daniel caused a laugh by claiming credit for getting the Democrats and Republicans together on one subject.

raised could be made was defeated.[22] The Senate was determined to limit its action on this occasion to tenure alone, and it did so.

Despite frequent denials to the contrary, party politics entered definitely into the debates in Congress. The principal demand for setting the time-limit on the term of the President came from Republicans, and the strongest opposition to it was offered by Democrats, who professed to see in it a slur on the memory of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. All in all, however, the debate was maintained on a fairly high plane.

The fate of the proposed amendment now rests with the legislatures of the states. If the past history of such proposals may be used as a basis for prophecy, favorable action will probably be taken, since every amendment presented to the states since the Civil War, with the lone exception of the child labor amendment, received speedy approval.[23] A two-thirds vote in both houses of Congress seems to indicate wide public support of proposed amendments. It is rather to be regretted, however, that the Senate did not insist upon ratification by state conventions, in order that there might have been a more direct test of public sentiment on a question of constitutional development which for so long has been a matter of discussion and controversy.

NEGLECTED ASPECTS OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL FISCAL RELATIONS

WYLIE KILPATRICK
U. S. Bureau of the Census

Among the luxuries that Americans indulge in during the current prosperity and high-income level is complacent disregard of the more serious aspects of intergovernmental fiscal relations. Ominous cracks and crevices in the fiscal structure temporarily close during a period when the price can be paid for disregarding them. A depression, however, uncovers already existing problems and aggrevates preëxisting evils.

To canvass interlevel financial relations at a time when emergencies did not force impromptu solutions was the purpose of a round-table discussion of the American Political Science Association, convening at Cleveland, December 27 and 28, 1946. Since multiple taxation and the need for tax coördination have been examined—and will continue to be surveyed—by economists, the round-table's attention was directed rather to aspects of

[22] *Ibid.*, pp. 2054–2055.

[23] Unless special sessions of numerous legislatures are called, it will be impossible to complete ratification in less than two years. In forty of the states, the legislatures meet in odd-numbered years, and the 1947 sessions of most of them have expired. Their next regular sessions will not be held until 1949.

the problem which are neglected when intergovernmental relations are viewed solely or primarily in terms of taxation. The round-table discussion of other aspects is here reported by its chairman, Wylie Kilpatrick, of the Governments Division, U. S. Bureau of the Census. Participants included Charles S. Ascher, of the National Housing Agency; Hubert R. Gallagher, associate director of the Council of State Governments; W. Brooke Graves, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; I. M. Labovitz, Fiscal Division, U. S. Bureau of the Budget; and Lewis B. Sims, Governments Division, U. S. Bureau of the Census.

The shifting content of interlevel fiscal relations, changing with different periods, requires a re-survey of the current picture to prevent irrelevancy arising from considering facts which, however much they once were true, no longer obtain today. A conference before World War I would have needed a microscope to examine the new and tiny federal grants to states. Speculation would have been rife as to whether the national government would ever adequately utilize the income tax power recently granted by the Sixteenth Amendment. During the 1920's, an economy-minded conference would have been alarmed at the rapid rise of property taxes and of state and local debt, and correspondingly gratified by the simultaneous reduction of federal debt. Round-tables during the 1930's could choose many topics from the kaleidoscopic New Deal measures and might have contributed a chapter to a book on the "Economic Consequences of John Maynard Keynes," treating of the effect of compensatory spending on intergovernmental relations. The present-day note was sounded by the report of the Federal Economic Council to the President. After trouncing compensatory spending, the Council subscribed to a quasi-Keynesian concept that judicious borrowing is justified if, when, and as deficit financing brings results that can be secured in no other way.

Current Fiscal Picture. Such cautious restraint in borrowing is in keeping with the current status of governmental finance, which was summarized by Lewis B. Sims. The likely balance of the federal budget for 1947 and the anticipated balance for the following year meant that the federal government was joining state and local governments in surplus financing. So-called state "surpluses"—more accurately termed "unexpended balances"—available for general expenditure totaled $2.9 billions on June 30, 1946, for general, highway, and postwar-reserve funds. If other state funds and all local unspent balances were added, total available balances might approach $4.5 billions, exclusive of reserves for sinking and trust funds. Simultaneously with the accumulation of this balance, state and local debt decreased from a peak of $20.2 billions in 1940 to $15.9 billions in 1946. Obviously, state and local officials do not need to come to Washington with cup in hand to beg for succor. Federal aid must be evaluated on a plane entirely different from the 1930's. Federal aid now must be weighted

according to the relative functional claims of all governments on different revenue sources in relation to the degree of federal interest in functions requiring financing by more than one government.

Deferment of a large part of capital outlay and of not a little maintenance enabled states and localities to keep their expenditure on a fairly even keel during the war. Total expenditure of $11.1 billions in 1941 rose only to $11.5 billions by 1945 (exclusive of the double counting of intergovernmental aid). The postwar jump began in 1946, when state and local expenditure was estimated at $12.4 billions, the increase being largely in local spending. The upward trend in payrolls, already evident during the war, was accelerated during 1946 with a moderate resumption in capital outlay. The present price level will add further to the upward trend; and any new or extended services must be paid for with inflated dollars.

In lieu of the duress of a depression, America has the duress of painful adjustment to budgets that must be balanced willy-nilly, to state and local expenditure that inevitably is rising, to sources of revenue that want relief after war strains, and to a debt trend with a likely state and local increase and a federal hoped-for decrease. As the shoe pinches more and more, questions arise as to the allocation of revenue and costs among governmental levels. The continuance of a high-level national income, if it does continue, provides no easy answer, because postwar public spending is so much bigger (especially if the federal debt is appreciably reduced) than before the war. A dip in the national income, which the Federal Economic Council holds is a possibility for 1947, will accentuate interlevel strains.

Vulnerable Position of the States. Even without a recession, numerous signs presage a cloudy and uncertain future for the states, according to Hubert R. Gallagher. Among these signs are unstable revenue, higher budget estimates, demands for salary increases, high cost of materials, drives for tax reductions, and threatened raids on reserves and tax resources by local units and bonus-seeking groups of veterans. Control over these threats is the first step in guarding the vulnerable finances of the states, and hence in lessening interlevel difficulties.

To maintain the states' solvency—and by the same token to improve intergovernmental fiscal relations—the Committee on Tax and Fiscal Policy of the Council of State Governments has urged the states to:

1. "Continue anti-inflationary policies, especially maintenance of tax rates, retention of reserves, and deferment of all except necessary capital expenditure, until inflationary pressures are eased.

2. "Prepare a long-range program for the financing of the state government, including accumulation of surpluses, incurring and management of bonded indebtedness, and changes in tax rates, so that a stable and expanding basis for state expenditure may be maintained through cyclical fluctuations in business activities.

3. "Provide for a unified annual executive budget comprehending all the revenue

and expenditure of the state, prepared by a strong permanent budget office, and integrate all aspects of financial administration, except post audit, in a single department of finance responsible to the governor.

4. "Establish a balanced combination of taxes to provide adequate average revenues through cycles in employment and business activity.

5. "Eliminate conflicts with the federal government through mutual abandonment of competing fields of taxation, so far as this is feasible.

6. "Request the federal government to adopt the following legislative programs to assist the states:

a. A clear and consistent policy for federal grants to the states; and

b. A consistent policy for payment of taxes or payments in lieu of taxes to state and local governments for certain types of federal property located within their jurisdictions."

While these recommendations, if followed, will go far toward preparing the states for the uncertain future, many other intergovernmental fiscal problems will continue to plague state officials. Of utmost importance is the fact that the state governments are unhappily in the middle. On one side, local governments, particularly the larger cities, are demanding services and crying for a larger share of the states' tax revenues or for permission to dip a municipal bucket into the states' tax resources; on the other hand, the federal government continues at a highly accelerated rate to make grants-in-aid and in other ways to incur expenditures which the states are expected to match. Congress appropriated over $1,100 millions in 1946 for matching grants-in-aid of one kind or another. In making these appropriations, Congress did not take into consideration how these programs, most of them of a continuing nature, would affect the future financial condition of the states. The states must either put up their portion of the funds to match federal funds or lose their pro rata share of the federal appropriation.

Reëxamination of Fiscal Aid. The paradoxical result is that intergovernmental aid, which is given the greatest stress in interlevel relations, is one of the most neglected aspects. That is, the accretion of diverse types of grants and shared taxes, each of which is often given minute attention, results in a "grandma's quilt" pattern, which has received slight attention as a whole. Intergovernmental aids, except for certain shared taxes, are not to governments but to bits of governments—the functions selected for preferment. The to-be-expected result is that fiscal aid, especially federal aid, distorts budgeting, which conceives of financing governments as a whole, while the grant systems work within functional compartments separate from each other.

How can state and local budgeting, subject to outside pressures, weight the relative claims of all services from a general perspective? As Dr. Joseph P. Harris demonstrated several years ago, budgeting becomes lopsided through the enforced distortion of a grant system that unthinkingly selects some services for preference and leaves others in the "doghouse."

State relations to counties, in which the states deal not with governments but with separate functions, constitute a warning for federal relations to states. The erosion of county government that followed from breaking up state relations into unrelated segments suggests a similar erosion of states if federal relations are not with governments as a whole, but merely with unrelated functional agencies. The consequence is not surprising. Functional officers compete with each other within the same units for aid from other units, and the general finance officers attempt to shake down the other units in order to keep down the tax rates eyed by the electorate. Under government by grab-bag, the federal government preëmpts lucrative revenue sources of states, which seek compensatory federal aids; the states simultaneously whittle down the local property tax base and grab sources of local revenue; and local governments look both to the federal and state governments for compensatory aids.

A controversial question of fiscal aid that heated debates prove is not neglected, except in the lack of harmonious relations, is whether federal aid intended ultimately for local governments should be channeled through the states or be directly dispensed to cities and counties. Perhaps the best that can be said for the federal government is that each aid system has sought an accommodation with the needs of each function. The present federal highway aid to local units is channeled through state highway departments because federal aid to state highways had fostered an acceptable mechanism for the state receipt and supervision of highway funds. Such a state mechanism is lacking in the housing field, pointed out Charles S. Ascher, aside from New York and a few other states. Consequently, federal aid for public housing by-passes the states and goes directly to local housing authorities.

The weakness of the particularistic solution was revealed by the long-drawn-out deadlock over federal aid for airports, culminating in the straddle of the 1946 federal airport act. Although this measure authorized the Civil Aëronautics Administration to deal directly with cities and other localities, without reference to states, a gesture to state participation allows states to prohibit local applications to the CAA and to set up state airport agencies through which federal aid will clear for local airports approved by the states. A nation-wide system of airports, in which different levels harmoniously coöperate, is jeopardized when the acrimonious Congressional debate on interlevel relations is continued in forty-eight state legislatures and hundreds of city halls, resulting in unlike systems in different states.

Part or all of these disquieting conditions may have been in the mind of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor when it reported in 1946 that "the present situation on federal grants to states and local governments is extremely chaotic." Although the Senate refrained from

authorizing an investigation of federal aid, three official organizations are undertaking a comprehensive study of the system or lack of system for federal grants. The Council of State Governments, the Governors' Conference, and the National Association of State Budget Officers will reappraise both the financial and the administrative policies involved in fiscal aid.

State-Local Relations. The question as to whether the states should serve as an intermediary between federal and local governments has emerged because, to no small degree, many states have been unequipped to deal effectively with their communities. After the experience of the 1930's, the view of not a few city officials was expressed several years ago by Mayor Scully of Pittsburgh: "We have developed a direct city-federal axis which has largely cut through our former structure of sovereign states and left them with no function in very important municipal phases. To an amazing extent, this has been the fault of the states themselves. They have simply refused to streamline their governmental facilties to meet the problems which cities face."

Not awaiting the pressures of special groups, responsible state and local officials themselves have taken the initiative in formulating reforms for state-local relations. In 1941, a survey of state supervision of local finance was completed under the auspices of the Municipal Finance Officers Association, indicating that the city officials subject to supervision approached the subject with an open mind.[1] Conversely, the Council of State Governments, composed of states whose officers supervise local finance, has recently completed a broad study that reveals a sympathetic understanding of local problems and of the need to strengthen local institutions so as to maintain a democratic balance among levels of government in our federal system.[2] The persuasive devices of supervision, according to the Council, are the most effective ones. State compulsion should be used only to establish minimum standards and to meet emergency situations. The types of supervision that substitute opinions of state officials for those of local officials should be avoided. State supervision should emphasize the attainment of high levels of local performance, the achievement of high local personnel standards, the expansion of training programs, and the provision of technical advice and assistance.

If the states are becoming vulnerable in their fiscal status, the localities are doubly vulnerable because their revenue position is inherently weak in their reliance upon property taxes, and largely frustrated in their search for "new" local revenues that disconcertingly turn out to be "old" ones. In consequence, local officials are increasing their drive, often with justification, to secure a larger share of state revenue. One of the most liberal

[1] See Wylie Kilpatrick, *State Supervision of Local Finance* (Public Administration Service, 1941).

[2] Council of State Governments, *State-Local Relations* (1946).

states in aiding localities, New York, paid 55 per cent of its total tax revenue to local units in 1946–47. Opposing a further increase in state aid, Governor Dewey in 1947 approved home rule tax laws authorizing cities and counties to choose from a "cafeteria" of sales and other locally administered taxes. How home rule? This phrase may be intrepreted to mean indiscriminate addition of local sales and income taxes to already complex state and federal levies, or local surtaxes added to state rates for state collection and remission to local treasuries. An aspect of home rule in taxation likely to be neglected in the search for new revenue is the strengthening of the property tax through reform of assessed valuations and tax limits.

Undoubtedly no phase of intergovernmental relations has been given more attention than the traditional state-local relations; and no phase, likewise, is more likely to be neglected when considering federal leadership in interlevel affairs. One school of thought, the ultra-strict constitutionalist, would debar federal influence from local relations to states, which, in its view, should exclusively control. Another school of thought, the ultra-liberal, would dismiss state-local relations as archaic survivals to be circumvented. Our federal mechanism cannot function if either view prevails. In the view of W. Brooke Graves, we must visualize the whole field of intergovernmental relations and the interrelationship of all the parts. The problem is to substitute a flexible organization permitting coöperative action among the three levels of government for the "dead hand" of rigid constitutional and statutory detail without resorting to the "iron hand" of national centralization. Functions no longer are performed exclusively by one level of government; rather two, and often three, levels participate.[3] Federalism can assume a new form, in keeping with the needs of modern society, if functional responsibility is so allocated as to enmesh the different governmental levels in an administration at once efficient and democratically accountable.

New Devices and Areas. Significant application of this view was given by

[3] This viewpoint is illustrated by the comment of the chairman of the California Legislative Committee on Highways, Streets, and Bridges. He concluded that: "Our studies and many hearings have shown us that no satisfactory approach to this extremely difficult and expensive task can be made until we learn to look at our road plant as one vast, integrated, and interconnected system of highways, streets, and bridges which provides all our people with a unified transportation service. This service does not stop when one of its vehicles reaches the limits of a city or county line. This concept does not mean that one jurisdiction should be substituted for our four levels of government when we turn to the problem of whether the federal government, the state, the counties, or the cities should have the administrative responsibility for constructing or maintaining a link in our road system. It means that all levels of government should work together in mutual confidence and cooperation."

Dr. Graves in alluding to new governmental mechanisms. In an effort to escape from "big government," which seems unsuited to the performance of certain functions, we compromise in some cases between control either from Washington or from state capitals by regional or zone administration, the purpose of which is "to get government closer to the people." One type of regionalism facilitates centralization by setting up administrative districts unconcerned with state and local governments. This type saves traveling expenses by field agents. Another regionalism works with and through states and communities; thus self-government is revitalized rather than eroded.

When existing units of government are found inappropriate in a changing society, an already complicated public structure is made more complicated by new types of units or organs. On the federal level, governmental corporations have proliferated; on the state level, "authorities" have emerged to escape financial control; and on the local level, special-purpose districts have multiplied to do what existing governmental units ought to be prepared to do—but are not. Without a blanket condemnation, these new units tend to be "neither fish nor flesh, nor good red herring." Few criticize the creation of local authorities to administer public housing; indeed, the alternative was central control. Few criticize the creation of units of the type of the New York Port Authority, which performs an interstate rôle not provided for by other units. An acid test of too many special organizations, however, reveals unnecessary complications often made possible by lax state authorizations or by federal stimulus in dispersing loans and grants. Since interlevel relations have served as the midwife at the birth of many special units, the same relations can serve for prenatal control.

Unbalance in business and industry has occurred when the states erect impediments to the free flow of trade and commerce across state lines. This process of "balkanization" results from the erection of interstate tax and trade barriers. A federalistic balance may be attained, even when uniformity is called for, without national assumption of state prerogatives. The movement for uniform state laws is succeeding in too many areas to warrant rehearsal of the facts here. A suggestive application of this method is urged by Dr. Clarence Heer to remove tax differentials among manufacturing corporations in Southeastern states. Interstate equalization of industrial tax loads in the Southeast, although not of all taxes, could be attained by reciprocal agreements among the participating states so as to terminate the competitive undercutting of taxes as an inducement to industrialists in locating plants.

Likewise illustrating the use of existing governmental bodies—acting together instead of separately—is the Pacific Coast Board of Intergovernmental Relations. Organized in 1945, this Board meets quarterly to repre-

sent the states, cities, and counties, as well as the federal regional offices, in California, Oregon, and Washington. Participants consider mutual problems, especially where several levels are in the same field, with a view to eliminating duplication of laws and administration and to planning appropriate action by each level. Advisory conclusions are referred to responsible agencies.

These examples disclose that many of the stresses and strains among governments can be lessened, if not eliminated, by directing attention to governmental organization and area. Big problems do not necessarily call for big panaceas, but for little solutions that reduce the magnitude of the difficulty. Nowhere is this approach better illustrated than in the allocation of functional responsibility among governments. At times drastically, and at times imperceptibly, functional duties have shifted among levels so that responsibility is largely the result of accident or compromise. The painful fact is that no one knows with any degree of completeness or accuracy what is the functional allocation among types of government. A few know a great deal about a little; and a great many know a little about a great deal. Intergovernmental fiscal relations need not so much a resurvey of the tax conflicts so admirably studied by the U. S. Treasury group[4] as a virginal plowing of the field of functional allocation, performance, and costs. A special commission of the stature of the Hoover Commission on Social Trends or of the Roosevelt Committee on Economic Security, in the opinion of Dr. Graves, is needed to take an inventory of existing functional patterns as a basis for reallocating functions and costs among governmental levels.

Mechanisms for Interlevel Coöperation. Our constitutional structure, declared I. M. Labovitz, suffers from a gap in the machinery provided for intergovernmental fiscal coöperation. Although this situation has been widely discussed, the deficiency persists because of general unfamiliarity with the specific needs for interlevel coöperation, uncertainty about the nature and functioning of any mechanism that might be established, and some interstate and state-federal competition of interests—a competition that is partly real, partly fanciful. Development of concrete proposals for intergovernmental fiscal machinery would help clarify the need and resolve the difficulties.

What tasks might be assigned to a new interlevel body in the field of fiscal affairs? Such an agency could be asked to formulate recommendations for achieving harmonious fiscal policies. On the basis of negotiations and research under its sponsorship, an intergovernmental board might produce recommendations and reports on specific current problems—for example, the resolution of tax conflicts, collaboration in tax administra-

[4] Committee on Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations, U. S. Treasury, *Federal, State, and Local Government Fiscal Relations*, Sen. Doc. No. 69, 1943.

tion, and the effects of tax immunities like those accorded federal real estate and municipal bond interest. Another assignment could be the promotion of more complete, uniform, and informative governmental accounts, statistics, and reports. The allocation of functions and financial resources among levels of government would be a primary subject for study by an interlevel board, which might propose reassignments of functions as well as changes in grants, tax-sharing, and taxing authority.

No intergovernmental agencies should be set up without recognition of the rôles of existing agencies. Congress and the state legislatures, needless to say, exercise a primary control of fiscal policy that, instead of being impaired, would be implemented by the technical "spade-work" and advice of the proposed body. The Federal-State Relations Section of the Department of Justice serves as a clearing house within the federal government for state legislation of federal interest. Without formulating proposals, this section collaborates with legal drafting committees of the Council of State Governments and the National Association of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. Numerous informal and extra-governmental conferences deal with fiscal coördination. So do the numerous organizations of state and local governments and officials, but their membership ordinarily represents a particular type of government or a specialized subject-matter interest. The Pacific Coast Board is one of the few interlevel organizations without restricted jurisdiction. Organizations of all these types frequently work out intergovernmental agreements on specific problems. They perform representative and consultative functions that contribute to coöperation among units of government.

The Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury Department have been compelled to consider the effect of federal taxation and expenditure on state and local finance and the reciprocal effect of state and local taxation and expenditure on federal finance. The heads of these agencies during the war were designated by the President to represent the federal government on the Joint Federal-State-Local Committee on Fiscal Policies and Practices. The functioning of this Committee, in which the Council of State Governments supplied the state-local membership, aided in achieving coordination of fiscal policies during the war. For peacetime, the Council of Economic Advisers, established under the Employment Act of 1946, has similar objectives in the interest of supporting high-level employment and production; and it is authorized to establish advisory committees. The individual federal program agencies also have varying methods and mechanisms for intergovernmental clearance, consultation, and advice. The Federal Security Agency, since its reorganization last year, has established a specialized unit to deal with federal-state relations in the welfare field.

What are the shortcomings of the existing agencies affecting intergovernmental relations? Except Congress perhaps, each is representative

of a particular type or level of government. This particularism gives rise to procedural and voting difficulties when representatives meet in joint groups. With the exception of the legislative bodies and chief executives, each agency is concerned with a limited subject-matter. Consequently, each is constrained to give specialized and fragmentary attention, rather than general consideration, to intergovernmental fiscal relations; to approach them in the light of its own responsibility and convenience; and to stop short at its own jurisdictional borders.

To overcome these limitations, the Treasury Committee on Intergovernmental Relations in 1943 recommended the creation of a Federal-State Authority, consisting of one member appointed by the President, one selected by a conference of state governors, and one named by these two. Mr. Labovitz vigorously opposed making the agency representative of governmental levels, a characteristic stressed by the Treasury suggestion that costs be shared between the federal and state governments. Such a plan would fail to correct the major shortcoming of the agencies already available to foster interlevel coöperation; the members would represent particular units and would tend to act on their behalf to "fragmentize" problems.

Under whatever name, the proposed body should be composed of citizens experienced in governmental affairs who are able to think in terms of the national system of government rather than of any one type or unit of government. Instead of spokesmen for particular points of view, what is wanted are spokesmen of the general public who can transcend and thereby reconcile conflicting points of view. The proposed body should be purely advisory and consultative, without the constraints of legislative or administrative responsibility. A continuing council of this character is necessary to meet the day-to-day problems of inter-unit relationships that arise in our federal system of government with its thousands of separate units.[5]

[5] Interpretations and suggestions in the foregoing article are those of the participants in the panel session and are not to be imputed to the organizations with which panel members are associated.

FOREIGN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

DUE PROCESS FOR EX-DICTATORS; A STUDY OF JUDICIAL CONTROL OF LEGISLATION IN GUATEMALA*

J. A. C. GRANT
University of California (Los Angeles)

Early in 1931, General Jorge Ubico Castaneda established in Guatemala one of the tightest dictatorships in all Latin America. For many years, his régime was not only popular, but benevolent. General Ubico loved his country, and under his leadership there was a remarkable increase alike in administrative efficiency and public honesty. Under the *Ley de Probidad*,[1] one of his first statutes, every important government official from the president down was required to file a sworn statement upon assuming office of all property owned by him and by his immediate family, to serve as the possible basis of an accounting on termination of his services. Government employees receiving funds were required to give a receipt, made out in duplicate upon official blanks that must be accounted for, upon pain of a fine amounting to twice the amount involved, one-half of which was to be paid to the informer.[2] No one could tell when General Ubico would "drop in" on him to audit his books and examine his papers, as he could reach even the most out-of-the-way government offices on his motorcycle. Indeed, "government by motorcycle" became a popular phrase of the day in reference to this rugged and domineering personality.

Although the constitution provided in Article 66 that the presidential term of office should be six years, and that no president should be re-elected until he had been out of office for at least twelve years, a subservient Congress that had virtually abandoned its legislative powers to the executive called for a national plebiscite on extending General Ubico's term, and following a favorable vote the constitution was amended to provide that he should continue as president until March 15, 1943, Article 66 remaining in suspense until that date.[3] Late in 1941, the constitution was again amended to extend his term another six years.[4] Yet on July 3,

* This article grew out of short stays in Guatemala while traveling to and from Colombia to complete the research on a project begun in 1942 on a Guggenheim Fellowship but interrupted by war service. The author also wishes to thank the Social Science Research Council, which subsidized the second trip.

[1] Decreto No. 1707 of May 9, 1931.
[2] Decreto gobernativo No. 1222 of Feb., 1937.
[3] Decreto No. 4 of July 11, 1935.
[4] Decreto No. 2 of Sept. 12, 1941.

1944, finally having become aware of the fact that he had lost the support of the citizenry when his suspension of certain civil rights in an effort to put down a strike of university students resulted in a general strike, he resigned, handing over the government to a military junta, headed by Federico Ponce Vaides, which he himself selected before resigning.

General Ubico stayed on in Guatemala, apparently confident that the populace would soon rally to his support and demand that he be recalled to office. Instead, when his successor attempted to carry on in the Ubico manner, the *pueblo* joined with the army in the popular "Revolution of October 20," 1944, and the General and his wife, Dona Marta Lainfiesta Dorión de Ubico, were "invited" to leave the country. They went to New Orleans, where the General, deserted even by his closest friends and broken in health and spirit, died.

He did not die a broken man financially. In fact, General Ubico did quite well by himself as president. In 1933, he was voted a life pension "equivalent to the salary that the budget provides for the President" ($1,000 per month), thus in effect doubling his salary.[5] Later, in a statute stating that he had rendered "great services" to the country, he was granted an outright gift from the public treasury of $200,000.[6] But the *Junta Revolucionaria* which took over following the revolution of October 20, and served until a new Congress and a new President had been elected, was of the opinion that his real source of financial gain had been of a different nature. Stating that "during the administrations of Ex-Presidents Jorge Ubico and Federico Ponce Vaides, various public officials and employees, taking advantage of their official positions . . . acquired from institutions of credit, from different agencies of the government, and from private persons, property for less than its real value . . . ," the *Junta* decreed: "Art. 1. Sales of real or personal property that have been effectuated by institutions of credit, by government agencies, or by private persons in favor of public functionaries or their relatives within the fourth degree of consanguinity or the second of affinity, for less than their real value at the time of their alienation, even though made at public auction, shall be reputed fraudulent and, in consequence, void."[7] Although the Congress, in approving this decree, added the requirement: "And provided that compulsion in any form was used against the sellers,"[8] this was removed by later amendment,[9] leaving the presumption of force to follow

[5] Decreto No. 1905 of Apr. 8, 1933. Here, as throughout the paper, I use dollars rather than quetzales because this will be more meaningful to the reader. The two have remained on a par throughout the entire period involved.

[6] Decreto No. 2445 of Apr. 23, 1940.

[7] Decreto No. 38 of Dec. 15, 1944.

[8] Decreto No. 125 of May 31, 1945, Art. 1.

[9] Decreto No. 173 of Oct. 15, 1945, Art. 1.

as a legal consequence of proof of a sale below "true" market value. Prospective plaintiffs were given four years in which to institute such suits, the period to run from the promulgation of the decree.

Under Guatemalan procedure, proof of such an issue as the value of the property when sold is made by each party hiring his own expert witnesses, a procedure that is virtually tailor-made for a plaintiff desiring to avail himself of such a statute as this. Since property values had nearly doubled in Guatemala in the decade 1935–45, almost every potential plaintiff stood to gain from a cancellation of his sale. But as the Guatemalan constitution provides that, save for certain exceptions not pertinent here, changes in the law "have no retroactive effect,"[10] and since it also provides that statutes conflicting with the constitution are void *ipso jure*,[11] it was inevitable that the validity of this presumption of force, and its application to claims already outlawed by lapse of time, should be questioned in the courts. The test case turned out to be that of Marroquín c. Lainfiesta de Ubico,[12] in which a closely divided Supreme Court reversed the trial court and the Court of Appeals and held the statute void. The arguments of counsel and the opinions of the courts beautifully illustrate the nature and working of judicial review in Guatemala, and also show how the Guatemalan judges have been able to construe a simple prohibition against retroactive legislation in such a way as to accomplish the same ends that our own courts have accomplished with that magic phrase, "due process of law," or that the Colombian courts would reach under their specific constitutional provision that "private property and other rights acquired . . . in accordance with the civil law . . . cannot be disregarded or violated by subsequent laws."[13]

Marroquín c. *Lainfiesta de Ubico.* The defendant, wife of the dictator, purchased a small farm from the plaintiff in 1936 for $4,000. On May 30, 1945, the latter sued to cancel the sale as having been made under duress for less than the true value of the property. He offered some evidence of the greater value of the property, but relied largely upon the statutory presumption of duress thereby brought into play to prove the really crucial issue. Defense counsel conceded that if the sale was made under duress it was, under recognized principles of the Guatemalan codes that needed no special statute to implement them, subject to cancellation by suit in

[10] Constitution of 1945, Art. 49.

[11] *Ibid.*, Art. 50.

[12] The opinions of the Supreme Court, dated Apr. 4, 1946, have been published in the *Diario de Centro América*, Vol. 46, no. 51, pp. 535–536, and these, together with the opinion of the Court of Appeals, will later be published in the *Gaceta de los Tribunales*. I have used the *expedientes* in the archives of the respective courts, which, in addition to the opinions, contain all briefs and motions of counsel and all evidence introduced at the trial.

[13] Constitution, codification of 1945, Art. 26.

the courts; but he pointed out that the statute of limitations on such suits was four years, so that in the absence of proof that for some acceptable reason, such as intimidation of the plaintiff or of the judges, the suit could not have been brought during the period of the dictatorship, the right to sue had become barred by the statute of limitations in 1940. He attacked the statute purporting to revive this cause of action nearly five years after it had expired as an unconstitutional effort to disturb a right vested under an executed contract by special legislation "deliberately passed to despoil of their property persons who are not acceptable to the current régime . . . illegally and unjustly . . . " in violation of the constitutional mandate against retroactive legislation.

The issue of the constitutionality of the statute was thus squarely presented to the trial court for ruling. It chose to uphold the law, however, and in its judgment of November 21, 1945, it ordered the property, together with all improvements, reconveyed to the seller upon repayment of the purchase price. The defendant immediately appealed, the appeal brief arguing: "Only Jesus in his omnipotence could raise Lazarus from the dead, but the present Congress with its statute cannot revive the perfected prescription because this is forbidden" by the constitutional provision against retroactive legislation. "The judges are . . . obligated to declare in concrete cases the unconstitutionality of statutes that suffer such defects. . . . Every law passed contrary to a constitutional precept is a void law, that is born dead and no judge may render a judgment based upon it."

The three-judge Court of Appeals, in a unanimous opinion dated February 4, 1946, agreed with the trial court that the plaintiff had proved that the property had been sold for less than its real value, the defendant having failed to introduce evidence to contradict the testimony of the two expert witnesses called by the plaintiff, and that the presumption of duress and consequent nullity of the sale created by the statute were thereby brought into play. It also found that there was some evidence of actual duress, but based its ruling upon the statutory presumption.

The validity of the statute was sustained by a line of reasoning that was both interesting and ingenious, and not without parallels in American constitutional decisions. Although conceding that "the legal presumption of fraud provided by the new law [was a] . . . legal innovation, . . . since no similar provision existed previously," it concluded: "Since legal presumptions are methods of proof, there is no doubt that whatever law creates, modifies, or repeals them has the characteristics of adjective or procedural law," and hence "involves no problem whatever of retroactivity," since "its legal effects are always subsequent to its enactment, even if its application may have relation to prior facts." The same is true of statutes of limitations and the rules of prescription, which furthermore

are passed to protect the public interest that the courts be not clogged with cases involving old claims rather than to create rights on the part of private litigants, especially where, as here, the civil code had not provided that causes of action concerning fraudulent contracts should "expire" in four years, but that the right to sue should "continue" for four years—a distinction of as doubtful significance in Roman as in common law, and one which the Supreme Court chose to ignore. Thus the Court of Appeals found it quite unnecessary to meet the defendant's argument of rights "vested" under an executed contract, since they had not yet—and apparently never would—become vested rights. It also held that this and other statutes passed since the revolution of October 20 justified the court in assuming, without special proof, that it would have been an idle gesture for the plaintiff to sue the defendant during the administration of her late husband, and hence in concluding that the time limit on the 1936 action, now implemented by the presumption created by the 1944–45 legislation, had not started to run at least until the resignation of General Ubico on July 3, 1944.

Not one of the five members of the Supreme Court seemed to find the reasoning of the Court of Appeals acceptable, although President Prado did insist that the statute should be sustained as necessary "to prevent the legalizing of injustices," and hence as falling within the exception authorizing retroactive legislation when required "by reasons of public order or social utility, or of national necessity."[14] He was willing to overlook the fact that this exception requires a special vote by Congress and express statement in the statute, which had not been done. Magistrate Cuevas del Cid, stretching the rules of hermeneutics and pleading beyond their breaking points, chose to dodge the constitutional issue of reviving a prescribed cause of action by insisting that counsel for the defendant had not properly pleaded prescription; but he did not explain how, if at all, he proposed to dodge the issue of the validity of the presumption created by Article 1 of the law. Possibly on this point, and on the merits, he intended to concur with the majority which reversed the lower courts, held the statute unconstitutional, and decided the case on its merits in favor of the defendant because the plaintiff had introduced no evidence to show that an honest trial of his case could not have been had during the period 1936–40.

The majority found little difficulty disposing of the statute. Rejecting the plea that changes in procedure can never be regarded as retroactive, even when applied to prior facts, they held that both the presumption of fraud and the revival of prescribed actions constituted changes in "clear conflict" with the fundamental law, since "it is unquestionable" that the

[14] Constitution of 1945, Art. 49.

statute "disturbs rights acquired under the dominion of other laws, which is juridically inadmissible." Our own courts would probably have reached similar conclusions under the doctrine that unreasonable presumptions and the disturbance of titles validated by prescription violate "due process."[15]

The Aftermath. Although this decision was a very great victory for Dona de Ubico and all others similarly situated, it is not necessarily decisive. It merely gives them a fighting chance. The way is still open, of course, to negative a defense of prescription by introducing evidence to show that no effective remedy was available to the plaintiff against favored persons during the Ubico dictatorship, and that the transaction was tainted by fraud or duress. How much evidence will be necessary to accomplish this result is a matter that hinges largely upon the attitude of mind of the judges under the new régime.

The widow of the ex-dictator is currently faced by more pressing problems. The *Ley de Probidad* has not yet been brought into play, as the government has not completed its survey of her properties and those of her late husband. It has, however, retroactively cancelled the pension of $1,000 per month granted in 1933[16] and the payment of $200,000 made in 1940,[17] alleging each to have been awarded to the then President in violation of the constitution, and has demanded repayment with interest—a total well in excess of a half-million dollars.[18] In addition, action has been instituted against the Ubico estate for $100,000 allegedly due on merchandise imported without payment of duties.[19] The list of goods involved and their respective duties is detailed and illuminating. Not only are there such items as "kodak film, $0.56," "part for radio, $1.20," and "album with photographs, $0.92," but also "6 motorcycles with equipment, $277.02," "7 motorcycles with sidecars, $393.02," and other even more expensive items, including numerous automobiles. Most of these motorcycles and automobiles are now, and have at all times been, in the service of the government. Either they were imported as government property, and hence were duty free, or they were imported as private property but are being retained by the government without legal action. The attorney for the estate asked that the government attach them as security for the payment of any duties that may be adjudged due; but the government has preferred to attach other properties, since these it already possesses.

[15] See Campbell v. Holt, 115 U.S. 620, 623 (1885); Manley v. Georgia, 279 U.S. 1 (1929); Western & A.R.R. Co. v. Henderson, 279 U.S. 639 (1929).

[16] Decreto No. 56 of Jan. 25, 1945.

[17] Decreto No. 54 of Jan. 23, 1945.

[18] Tribunal de Cuentas: Dirección General de Cuentas, Expediente No. 385 B of 1945.

[19] *Ibid.*, No. 385 of 1945.

No effort has been made as yet to contest the legality of these demands, although it is rumored that the widow intends shortly to return to Guatemala to fight these and other suits. It is impossible to prejudge their merits, or even to predict that the defendant will or will not get a fair hearing on the merits. All that can be said is that the Supreme Court has made a splendid start in attempting to guarantee that there shall be due process of law even for ex-dictators.

A closing word. Judicial review is not rendered an efficient weapon of control merely by providing a list of constitutional guarantees and imposing upon the courts the duty to interpret and enforce them. American judicial review became important only when the courts secured a position of relative independence from legislative control.[20] Guatemalan courts do not yet have this advantage. Supreme Court magistrates are elected by the Congress for four-year terms, and may be removed by the Congress by majority vote. Indeed, petitions are now pending in the Congress against the three magistrates who constituted the majority in the case of Marroquín c. Lainfiesta de Ubico looking toward their removal for "manifest incapacity" proved by their votes in that case. It is doubtful whether such action will be taken; but its mere possibility serves as a limiting factor upon the effectiveness of judicial control of legislation in Guatemala.

[20] See the discussion of Trevett v. Weeden, Rhode Island (1786), in C. G. Haines, *American Doctrine of Judicial Supremacy* (2d ed., 1932), pp. 105–112.

POLITICAL THEORY

BEYOND RELATIVISM IN POLITICAL THEORY[1]

ARNOLD BRECHT

Graduate Faculty, New School for Social Research

Modern science and modern scientific methods, with all their splendor of achievement, have led to an ethical vacuum, a religious vacuum, and a philosophical vacuum—so it has been said. For they have offered little or nothing to distinguish between good and evil, right and wrong, justice and injustice. All social sciences are involved in this calamity, but none has been so deeply affected as political science, which had to face the new creeds of Communism, Fascism, and Nazism as political phenomena of tremendous power. They settled down in the area abandoned by science, taking full advantage of the fact that, scientifically speaking, there was a vacuum.

No political theorist can honestly avoid the issue, and certainly every scholar worthy of the name gives it serious thought. While each may publish his own ideas freely, there is one thing which we cannot do individually, but which we may do collectively—take stock of the various opinions that prevail among us, and clarify their meaning by question and answer. This the members of a round-table tried to do at the last meeting of the American Political Science Association, in two sessions held jointly with the Research Panel on Political Theory, represented by its chairman, Francis G. Wilson of the University of Illinois.

The following scholars, selected out of the great number of interested theorists as fairly representative—at least within the secular branch of theory—of various approaches, backgrounds, and age groups, constituted the panel: Francis W. Coker of Yale University, author of *Recent Political Thought;* Benjamin E. Lippincott of the University of Minnesota, author of *Victorian Critics of Democracy;* Benjamin F. Wright of Harvard University, author of *American Interpretations of Natural Law;* Eric Voegelin of Louisiana State University, author of a three-volume history of political ideas to be published in the near future; John H. Hallowell of Duke University, author of *The Decline of Liberalism;* and J. Roland Pennock of Swarthmore College and Gabriel A. Almond of Brooklyn College, who, like Hallowell, had participated in a discussion of ethical values in this REVIEW.

[1] Analytical report on the round-table "Beyond Relativism in Political Theory" at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Cleveland, Ohio, December 27–28, 1946. Professors Francis W. Coker, J. Roland Pennock, and Francis G. Wilson read the draft and made valuable suggestions.

Mr. Pennock functioned as secretary, and the present writer served as chairman.[2]

This paper does not claim to be an historically exact report. It rearranges the debate analytically, and makes free use of written formulations and "extended remarks" laid down in subsequent correspondence. Passages put in quotation marks have been either submitted in writing or approved by the respective panel members.

I. HIGHER-LEVEL RELATIVISM[3]

Scientific relativism in the social sciences is based on the contention that no scientific method has yet been devised to determine the superiority of any ends or purposes over any other ends or purposes in absolute terms. We can state only their relative superiority as means in the pursuit of again other, ulterior, purposes or ends; which of these ulterior purposes or ends are superior to others is beyond the scope of scientific determination. To illustrate, there is according to relativism no scientific method by which to state, in non-relative terms, whether man has a specific dignity that ought always to be respected; whether the ends of the individual or those of the group are more important, and of which individual and which group; whether there is greater value in peace or war, in charity or selfishness, in the liberation of slaves or the enslavement of the free, in the goals of democracy or of fascism. As no less a man than Albert Einstein has said, science cannot even determine on rational grounds whether the existence of society is more valuable than its annihilation would be.

In discussing relativism, we are confronted with a certain ambiguity inherent in the terms "science," "scientific method," "knowledge," and "proof." And we must also be aware that there is more than one branch of relativism. Only very few relativists, if any, go so far as to deny that some ends or purposes *may* be superior or inferior to other ends or purposes. If such denial were the relativist position, we should need no meeting to cope with it, as it then would be sufficient to state that this position does not follow from the relativist premise. Precisely as the inability of scholars to prove the existence of God does not prove His non-existence, so their inability to prove the superiority of any ultimate purpose over any other would not prove that none is superior.

The round table, therefore, decided to concentrate on the higher forms of relativism. Higher-level relativists do admit that there *may* be an absolute truth regarding the superiority or inferiority of values and that some

[2] Hans Kelsen, University of California, who originally had planned to attend, was unable to appear. In a letter to the chairman, he stressed that, despite the unpopularity of relativism in the United States, he still is a relativist.

[3] This section contains an extract of the chairman's introductory remarks, which had been circulated among the panel members and were read to the group.

among us may see the truth correctly, while others do not. Nor do they even deny that a man's intuition of basic differences in the value of ends and purposes may reach the degree of absolute certainty to him and, therefore, to him may constitute part of "knowledge," of *his* knowledge. In other words, these relativists recognize the possibility that there might be a valid intuition regarding values. But they do deny that we can transmit or communicate our convictions, our "knowledge" or "intuition" regarding values, to other men in forms of proof or conclusive demonstration. They make a distinction between *subjective* conviction, intuition, or knowledge regarding the validity of value judgments, on the one side, and *intersubjective*, interpersonal, proof on the other. They contend that such intersubjective proof is not feasible.

I shall refrain from elaborating in abstract terms the reasons which the relativists have put forward in support of their thesis. Suffice it to recall that most relativists have insisted that value judgments, and especially ethical value judgments, are statements not of fact but of meaning, that they are statements not of what is but of what ought to be, and that it is not possible logically to derive a statement of what ought to be from a statement of what is. Some have gone so far as to say that sentences dealing with what ought to be are no statements at all, but merely express emotional preferences, commitments regarding one's own behavior, or the like.

But in so arguing most relativists—and this is a point of greatest importance to us—have not denied the possibility that the statement that something ought to be done, or the emotional preference for its being done, or the commitment to do it, may be based on divine influence or its equivalent. They have merely insisted that the assertion of divine influence or its equivalent is beyond demonstrability. Some have emphasized that such influence, if it were operative, would be a "fact" or an "event" in the realm of *is*. But they, too, have insisted that this fact, or this event, is beyond demonstrability in scientific terms, and that all assertions about, and all derivations from, it must therefore be treated as inconclusive in any truly scientific work.

Consequently, the thesis that the validity of ethical value judgments is beyond scientific demonstrability has become the core of the relativistic approach. For this reason, we gave it first place on our agenda: Is intersubjective proof possible regarding the superiority or inferiority of purposes or values in political matters?

The second point is closely connected with the first. Despite their skepticism regarding the demonstrability of values, the relativists do not deny that science can contribute its ample part to the discussion of values and of their rank by (1) clarifying the precise meaning of proposed evaluations and (2) examining the consequences of political actions based on

these evaluations. In dealing with these aspects of the problem, the higher-level relativists have been particularly productive and stimulating. Beginning with Max Weber, they have challenged all scholars to concentrate on an analysis of the meaning of evaluations and on their implications. Not only have they admitted, but they have ardently stressed, that such investigations are possible with scientific means, that they therefore are scientifically legitimate, and that they are practically significant as well.

This thesis is essentially not in contradiction with the position taken by anti-relativists. All scholars seem in fact to agree on it. Its significance rests rather in its negative limitation: relativists say that this kind of investigation is the only contribution that can be made by science or with scientific methods. Are they right in this? This was our second question.[4]

II. INTERSUBJECTIVE PROOF[5]

Most members of the panel explicitly or implicitly agreed with the relativists that intersubjective proof regarding the superiority of ultimate values, purposes, or ends over others is not possible in the sense of proof as

[4] The following references to the literature on the problem may be helpful:

Recent volumes of the REVIEW contain: William F. Whyte, "A Challenge to Political Scientists" (Vol. 37, Aug., 1943, pp. 792–797); John H. Hallowell, "Politics and Ethics" (Vol. 38, Aug., 1944, pp. 639–655); Francis G. Wilson, Benjamin F. Wright, Ernest S. Griffith, and Eric Voegelin, "Research in Political Theory—A Symposium" (*ibid.*, pp. 726–754); J. Roland Pennock, "Reason, Value Theory, and the Theory of Democracy" (Vol. 38, Oct., 1944, pp. 855–875); and Gabriel A. Almond, Lewis A. Dexter, W. F. Whyte, and J. H. Hallowell, "Politics and Ethics—A Symposium" (Vol. 40, Apr., 1946, pp. 283–312).

The international literature on relativism and beyond in political science and jurisprudence is traced in the following articles by Arnold Brecht: "Relative and Absolute Justice," *Social Research*, Vol. 6 (Feb., 1939), pp. 58–87; "The Rise of Relativism in Political and Legal Philosophy," *ibid.*, Vol. 6 (Sept., 1939), pp. 392–414; "The Search for Absolutes in Political and Legal Philosophy," *ibid.*, Vol. 7 (May and Sept., 1940), pp. 201–228 and p. 385 (erratum); "The Myth of Is and Ought," *Harvard Law Review*, Vol. 54 (Mar., 1941), pp. 811–831; and "The Impossible in Political and Legal Philosophy," *California Law Review*, Vol. 29 (Mar., 1941), pp. 312–331; see also, "Democracy—Challenge to Theory," *Social Research*, Vol. 13 (June, 1946), pp. 195–224.

Max Weber's basic essays, "Die 'Objektivität' in sozialwissenschaftlicher und sozialpolitischer Erkenntnis" (first published in 1904) and "Der Sinn der Wertfreiheit der soziologischen und ökonomischen Wissenschaften" (first published in 1917), will be found in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre* (Tübingen, 1922), pp. 146, 451.

[5] The term "intersubjective proof" is used, as explained in the previous section, to distinguish communicable, or interpersonal, proof from man to man, from one-sided "intuition," which by some writers is called proof too, but which is not "intersubjective" proof unless supported conclusively by data available also to others.

applied in logic and the natural sciences. This appeared so obvious to most speakers that they quickly turned to other questions of their own choosing. Before we follow them in this, it is advisable to report first on those contributions to the debate that referred more strictly to the possibility of intersubjective proof.

"The answer depends upon the meaning of proof," said Mr. Wright. "If proof is used as it is used by a practitioner of the natural sciences, then the term is misplaced in this setting."

"It is impossible to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that one value is preferable to another," Mr. Lippincott assented, and Mr. Pennock added: "Proof of values is impossible if by value we mean something transcendental. In fact, if we use such a meaning, we cannot even prove that there are such things, let alone what they are. If, on the other hand, we contend that what people mean by value can be defined naturalistically, proof as to what is valuable may be possible, depending on the nature of the definition."

Other speakers, however, suggested that interpersonal proof might be possible in some cases, especially in cases of extreme injustice and cruelty such as have been experienced during the last period of history.

"Although in the end values must be urged on a rational or an intuitional basis, rational discussion offers the possibility of intersubjective cogency of proof," Mr. Wilson held. "The categories of science are not automatically transferable to social issues. Such transfer must be governed by rational interpretation from within the body of social problems." And Mr. Almond said: "There is a growing body of evidence that men are anything but indefinitely plastic in their values. Perhaps the greatest challenge of political theory today is the task of participating in the search for a 'valid natural law theory.'"

The chairman proposed to go into details. It was his thesis that intersubjective proof is possible regarding certain elements of judgments on proposed purposes or ends in political matters. These verifiable elements are so important, he held, that in some cases the issue is essentially governed by them. Proof, he suggested, can be offered from two sides—from the outside and from the inside: "From the *outside*, the value of a political proposal can be attacked scientifically by proving that the proposal is impossible of execution—that it is impossible to reach the proposed goal at all, or to reach it with any known means, or to reach it with the means proposed. To give a drastic illustration, a proposal to harness the moon to the earth in such a position that the United States would always have the benefit of a full moon, can be demonstrated in scientific terms to be valueless without discussing ethical objections that might be raised on the ground that the proposal would discriminate against the Soviet Union. It is sufficient to demonstrate that according to scientific laws execution is impossible. He continued:

"By the same token it is feasible to demonstrate in scientific terms that it is impossible to guarantee that a dictator to whom total powers are given will always use them to good effect; that, if he is sane and of good will today he will be so next year, or that his successor will. It can also be shown that it is impossible, once a dictator is given total power, to remove him without his consent short of a revolution (logical impossibility); that it is impossible for a dictator, even if sane and of good will, personally to supervise the fair treatment of every individual in a hundred-million people (biological impossibility), and that, therefore, without independent institutions or freedom of public opinion, it is impossible to control the dictator's lieutenants to whom he has delegated local powers. Such investigations open up large fields for strictly scientific contributions in the struggle of political ideologies. Demonstration of impossibility refutes the alleged value of the proposal to the extent to which impossibility is demonstrated.

"From the *inside*, certain actions can be scientifically branded as unethical because they violate basic requirements. There are 'inescapable' elements in human thinking and feeling regarding basic ethical requirements. Under certain circumstances of contemplation, human nature inescapably feels revulsion against certain types of action, and approval of others, in a typically ethical kind. This old religious (and stoic) doctrine has been unjustifiably abandoned by secularized political theory. It should be revived, although in far stricter forms than those it assumed in the past. Most of the allegedly universal feelings are by no means universal, but they are limited to certain individuals or groups; and others, though fairly universal, are not entirely so. But some such reactions are actually so universal that no exception has ever been observed reliably, and that it is impossible for us even to imagine such exceptions.

"To illustrate: it seems that the feeling of justice and injustice is an 'inescapable' category of human feeling. Although opinions of *what* is just or unjust differ widely, some interconnection between justice and truth seems to be one of the invariant and universal elements of human feeling; it is inescapably felt to be unjust if someone knowingly makes an untrue discriminatory statement against another person or knowingly reproaches or punishes him for what not he, but somebody else, has done.

"It is another inescapable element in human feeling that things equal according to the accepted system of values must be treated as equal. Again, moral reproach and punishment meet inescapably with a feeling of injustice whenever it had been impossible for the blamed person to do what he was expected to do.

"The statements about universal elements are not derived from arbitrary definitions of justice, but they can be traced to inescapable factors in our human equipment. To investigate whether this is so is a reasonable proposition for scientific investigations."

When asked whether these elements are not too small and insignificant to provide a noteworthy advance beyond relativism, the speaker answered that, if one regards each separately, it might seem so at first sight; but if taken together and combined with the two methods recognized by the relativists—clarification of the meaning of proposed evaluations and analysis of their implications—the demonstrable elements obtain a surprisingly broad importance. Especially the requirement of *truth* in justice has tremendous consequences, objectively as well as subjectively, since pernicious politics have in most cases been based on falsehoods and outright lies for justification. And as to the category of impossibility, its importance, the speaker suggested, is clearly indicated by the few illustrations which he had given, and which could be amplified.

Mr. Pennock held that the "outside" proof offered is no proof of values, but merely proof that a given subject is not appropriate for a discussion about values. The speaker replied that precisely for this reason he had called this approach one from the outside, and not to abstract value but to "purpose." Purpose matters in the political field; it therefore is relevant to emphasize that science can discredit purposes by proving their achievement impossible. Such outside proof necessarily affects also the "value" of the proposal to pursue the purpose.

Messrs. Wilson, Pennock, Almond, Hallowell, and others suggested that at least some *approximation* to proof often seems possible regarding the validity of value judgments, especially in extreme cases. Scholars should "stop worrying about proof in a realm where it is impossible and be content with establishing plausibility," said Mr. Pennock. He contended that "inescapable elements," too, were no proof, but merely a case of approximation of proof. Universal agreement, while being no proof, could well be treated as an indication of proof, he added. "Let us assume," he said, "that where we find general agreement as to the good we may accept it as a plausible indication of truth; and let us devote our energies to the discovery of such agreements, to persuasive as well as logical efforts in this direction, and to the elucidation of the logical implications and causal relations of various public policies which relate them to the ultimate values. Here, I think, lie the great tasks of political theory, and more fruitful lines of inquiry than the attempt to prove the existence of absolute good."

Other panel members, however, criticized the appeal to mere "approximation" of proof, or "plausibility," as fallacious, because without first having an idea of what constitutes full proof one cannot know what is approximate proof. There is a natural inclination of all people, including scholars, they said, to consider their own value judgments so well supported that approximation of proof has been reached, just as we have been told alternately that there is approximate proof for the existence

of God and for His non-existence, or for and against immortality.

Mr. Wright stressed the value of disagreement for science. The chairman, replying to Mr. Pennock's remarks and to similar suggestions from the floor,[6] emphasized that agreement alone, even if far spread, is not even an approximation of proof. In antiquity, people agreed that slavery was necessary and just. But agreement, he said, which is substantially necessary according to the nature of man, constitutes a valid element in political science. It may not present conclusive proof for the metaphysical origin and validity of values, he admitted. But no such proof is required for the purposes of political science. All the political scientist needs is reference to invariant elements of ethical feelings that are inherent in human nature, and inescapably so. Whether such elements exist and what they are is a matter for empirical proof.

Mr. Hallowell made a case for Christianity. He argued that the answer to the questions as put depended on an answer to a prior question, namely: What is the nature and destiny of man? Concentrating on this question, he answered it as follows:

"I would suggest that the most adequate answer is given by Christianity. Christianity regards man as a rational creature, but does not overlook the fact that his ability to reason is warped by sin (i.e., pride in his own self-sufficiency). Endowed by his Creator with reason, man is capable of distinguishing good from bad, justice from injustice—it is just this attribute which distinguishes him from the beasts, which makes him a spiritual being. It is through reason as a supernatural faculty that truth is discovered and reality revealed. By enabling us to distinguish good from evil, reason is the most reliable guide to action. We must recapture our belief in man as a rational creature, and Christianity enables us to do so. But at the same time, Christianity teaches us that man (human nature) is warped by sin. It teaches us to approach the problems of political and social order, therefore, 'not with a broken and discredited intellect,' but with a 'broken and contrite heart.' It recognizes the evil in the world as the perversion of human will and urges men to repent and to bring their will into conformity with God's will. Only in this way can men realize their freedom. For freedom can be preserved and perpetuated only by linking our capacity to choose alternative modes of behavior with the faculty with which we were endowed by our Creator, reason. In the arbitrary separation of will from reason lies disaster; for a will without reason to restrain and guide it is blind and can lead us nowhere; and reason without the will to translate it into practice is impotent. By emphasizing understanding to the exclusion of choice, historicism reduces the mind to the

[6] Professor Hans J. Morgenthau (University of Chicago) suggested that in the course of most controversies on values it is possible to state agreement on some points.

rôle of an impotent spectator. By exalting choice at the expense of reason, existentialism reduces man to an irresponsible agent. Freedom is rational choice."

Other panel members replied that Mr. Hallowell's opinions, if he did not claim cogent demonstrability for them in discussions with persons who in good faith dissented, were entirely compatible with the views of the higher-level relativists, some of whom had confessed to a similar belief. "But what are you proposing to do if your opponent is a Mohammedan?," he was asked. "Convert him," Mr. Hallowell replied. Returning to his argument, he added:

"The proof of the truthfulness of Christianity is its correspondence to reality, i.e., the fact that it explains more adequately than any rival religion or philosophy all the facts of human nature and experience. In a sense, its truthfulness is derived, in part at least, from the inadequacy of all rival explanations of life. In another sense, its truthfulness is demonstrated by its practical fruits, i.e., that it does enable men to live serene and happy lives. It enables us to live in the present without either complacent optimism or helpless despair.

"Though based upon faith, it does not follow (as some mistaken people believe) that faith is necessarily irrational, for it is a faith in a reality that is super-rational. It is a faith that is illumined by reason, and a faith, in turn, that sustains reason."

Mr. Wright, commenting on this, warned against any form of belief which claims absolute knowledge of the truth. Such belief, he said, normally leads in politics to intolerance and to the application of violence against people of different convictions. "Any sensible theory of politics must deal with values, yet any which professes to have a monopoly of truth is certain to be ridiculous, and if taken seriously, almost certain to be dangerous."

Other panel members, while failing to acknowledge Mr. Hallowell's demonstration as scientific proof, took issue with Mr. Wright's counter-argument. "There is no necessary connection between a belief in absolute truth and a belief in personal infallibility," Mr. Pennock objected; and Mr. Hallowell rejoined that, "because a person believes that he knows a portion of truth, it does not follow that he believes everyone should be coerced into the acceptance of that truth." Other speakers pointed to the fact that the last three hundred years have been characterized by a struggle for separating a person's belief that he knows the absolute truth from his political attitude of tolerance toward non-conformists; if every claim to know the absolute truth made a person ridiculous or dangerous, we all were so, because we all believe with absolute assurance that certain cruel acts are unjust and base.

In spite of this intermezzo, however, most panel members emphasized

that Mr. Hallowell's arguments in favor of Christianity did not constitute conclusive proof in the scientific sense. "We cannot give a scientific demonstration, which is absolutely convincing, that Christianity is superior to Mohammedanism," Mr. Lippincott insisted. The chairman commented:

"Professor W. Ernest Hocking has called the human urge toward the good a response to a 'cosmic demand.' Personally, I accept this interpretation for myself, as I accept the religious interpretation of life. But if in a scholarly discussion someone should object that the response is not to a 'cosmic' demand, but rather to a 'cosmetic' demand, and that God's existence appears improbable to him, I must admit that my own interpretation is ultimately based on subjective experiences, which I can relate, but which can be plausible only to one who has had similar experiences and, consequently, generally plausible only with regard to elements that are experienced by every human being. Therefore I consider it so important to reinvestigate what these universally experienced elements are.

"Religious belief always leaves room for scientific doubt—though not for scientific refutation. It leaves room for such doubt also in the believer's own mind, who has constantly to sustain and defend his belief against this lack of scientific proof. Religiously speaking, God may have very good reasons why He leaves the final choice to personal, subjective decision rather than to scientific demonstration.[7] But that again I can only believe and not demonstrate cogently."

It was recognized, on the other hand, that scientifically Mr. Hallowell's approach was entirely legitimate if considered a "working hypothesis," established out of subjective belief and supported by observed facts and not contradicted by other facts. Several speakers agreed with Mr. Hallowell on the fruitfulness of scientific work based on this approach.

A side-issue of the discussion had to do with the rôle of *assumptions* in scholarly discussions. Said Mr. Lippincott: "If we assume, to begin with, that life is worth while and the good life in some form attainable, that the development of man's faculties and respect for personality are desirable goals, and that recognition of rights including freedom and justice are essential to achieving these objectives, then it can be shown that democracy is above all the system of government most likely to bring these about."

There was general agreement on the legitimacy and the practical value of assumptions, if they are frankly confessed to as being scientific assumptions (see below on the scholar as teacher); it was also shown that in this case they are not in conflict with the teachings of the higher-level rela-

[7] "In the wisdom of God, the world did not know God through wisdom." Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, I, 21.

tivists. But, being no proof, they do not help in discussions with those or against those who in good faith deny them. Greatest care is mandatory in scientific work with the use of assumptions, it was warned. To illustrate: in order to be conclusive, the assumptions made by Mr. Lippincott would have to include also the claim to equality concerning the rights he had assumed. This claim was, however, one of the main bones of contention.

Resuming the general issue of relativism and scientific method, Mr. Wright said:

"There is nothing wrong with scientific method, provided that it be a method adapted to the materials involved. But in practice we have relied too frequently upon what we thought were the methods of the laboratory scientists, hoping thereby to emulate the achievements of science during the last four centuries. We have gone down a lot of blind alleys and ended up with a lot of dull and irrelevant statistics. We have also made a measure of progress in the study of some aspects of politics. Whether a balancing of the books would indicate a credit or a debit, I am not quite sure; but I do feel certain that somewhat less of reliance upon quantitative method and considerably more attention to the questions which cannot be dealt with in that fashion would have resulted in a political science which would have been a considerable improvement over what we have.

"I say this as a precautionary foreword to the statement that even the worst aberrations of our quantitative and descriptive brethren are preferable to the mystical lucubration of their antagonists on the opposite wing. History is full of examples of the dangers to human well-being from those who *assume* the essential point involved, that is, the final validity of a particular doctrine, and who proceed to crusade with fire and sword in order to convince others of this everlasting truth. Relativism, yes and pragmatism, are just as essential in the study of the theories of justice and of right as in the study of municipal drainage systems, although the proportions may be a little different.

"I am not arguing that we should confine our discussion to descriptive political science, or that we should deal only with those things that can be seen, much less with those that can be measured quantitatively. One of the eternal questions of politics such as the nature of justice, or perhaps the meaning of justice in contemporary society, would not be lacking in elusiveness. Yet a consideration of it would, I believe, result in a more coherent discussion in the field of political science."

All speakers stressed the importance of the vocabulary used. Modifying his earlier praise of disagreement, Mr. Wright said, for example:

"I suspect that we are disagreeing about very little except a few words. If the subject for discussion were cast in the form of questions and concepts which could be discussed a little more precisely, even allowing for the various connotations of the words which we necessarily must use, we

should probably find very little disagreement among ourselves and very little difficulty in reaching a consensus of judgment upon the application or the validity of ethical value judgments."[3]

Some speakers insisted, however, that the difficulty was not merely in the use of words. On the other hand, there was general agreement that the great service which political science can render legitimately by clarifying the meaning and the implications of political proposals is likely to reduce the importance of the remaining difficulty—proof regarding the superiority or inferiority of ultimate goals or values.

Mr. Voegelin went further. Having not attended the greater part of this discussion, in one of its later stages he attacked the question of proof as irrelevant according to the present state of science. He said:

"This question, in order to be discussed sensibly, must be filled with meaning by relating it to the present state of science. If we make this attempt, we shall find, however, that this question is not related to the present state of science at all; it is related to a state of science which prevailed in a certain sector of the social sciences in the opening years of this century. Then was the time when the 'value free' discussion in politics was debated as a problem for the scholar, in particular in Max Weber's great essays on the objectivity of the social sciences. This state of science has been superseded by the developments of the last fifty years in the fields of philosophical anthropology, through the exploration of the relation between ethics and ontology, through the exploration of the myth, through the establishment of spiritual processes as the determinants in the formation of 'horizons' of values, through the historization of the problems of politics and the abolition of the problem of the 'best' form of government, through the rise of the philosophy of existence, and so forth. As a consequence of these developments, the problem of value judgments hardly has a place in the present state of science; it is superseded by problems of an entirely different kind. We are far 'beyond relativism' today—without having landed in any absolutism. Hence I am somewhat at a loss to formulate an answer to questions (1) and (2). In answer to the first question, I should have to say that it has ceased to be a relevant question today. In answer to the second, I should have to say that political theory has contributed plenty to this dispute during the last fifty years—so much, as a matter of fact, that question (1) has become obsolete. A discussion that would lead to sensible programmatic suggestions—that is, to suggestions which indeed can be considered an advancement of science and not a routine occupation on byroads—would presuppose that we digest

[3] Mr. Coker, after seeing the draft of this report, refrained from formulating any comment of his own in writing, because, as he expressed it with typical modesty, "I cannot think of anything to say that doesn't seem too obvious. I think the quotations from Wright are pretty close to my own reactions to the whole situation."

these developments and formulate our problems in relation to the present state of science."

Other panel members doubted whether modern relativism can be overcome by pointing to the fact that it was established fifty years ago and that other theories became fashionable thereafter, and they wondered whether Mr. Voegelin would have made his demurrer if he had attended the whole discussion. Actually, the chairman commented, he had introduced a second relativism instead of eliminating the first one.

"To the substantial relativism forced upon scholars by the limitations of knowledge and of intersubjective proof, Mr. Voegelin has added the historical relativism of scientific research, always building upon a previously established body of science, or in other words, the professional relativism of annotated writing, which forces every respectable scholar to take account of all other scholars of accepted standing.

"The history of ideas is eminently interesting and significant in many respects, but by pointing to it we do not answer the question of what *we* do think and believe to be true *today*. And to state that has been the purpose of this meeting. None of the recent adventures in thinking and research mentioned by Mr. Voegelin has freed us from the consequences of the fact that our scholarly knowledge is limited, and that our possibility of intersubjective proof is even more limited than our subjective knowledge."

Mr. Lippincott held that our excessive preoccupation with the history of theory has prevented us from tackling many important problems of today. "So long as we continue to devote the greater part of our energies to linking the ideas of the past in a time sequence, just so long do we fail to discharge the main purpose of theory, which is to ascertain the chief facts, concepts, and principles that do, may, or ought to arise as a result of governance."

Leaving alone proof of the validity of value judgments, some panel members addressed themselves more particularly to the second question as to whether science can contribute to the debate on values in other ways than by clarifying the meaning of proposed value judgments and analyzing their practical implications. Mr. Wilson, with general approval, stated that scholars have the indubitable task in the social sciences of investigating and explaining the *function* of values in particular situations. "Such investigations need not be predicated on the idea that a given value is true, but that it does function in directing, controlling, or modifying human action," he said. "The great areas of human conflict today can be seen as areas in which the dispute over values and purposes is most acute, and to help in the rebuilding of civilization, the student must be keenly aware of the function of values in society."

Mr. Almond emphasized that, since Weber's time, there has been con-

siderable progress in the "social psychological criticism of values:"

"Science can trace the *origins* of political values among individuals and groups, and indicate what types of social situations and associated psychological states are related to particular types of preferences. Perhaps the most significant contribution is the hypothesis that political as well as other values are to be understood not only as objective goals and purposes, but also in terms of their subjective relationships. The analysis of the subjective value dimension is still a new field, and perhaps only the fanatic can claim for this area of research anything more than partially validated hypotheses. Psychology and social psychology have done themselves damage by claiming more. But it has already been demonstrated through research in this area that the subjective purposes of an individual are often quite unrelated in a logical sense to the objective value he advocates. For example, political militance and radicalism, or any other combination of political means and ends, may be associated with logically irrelevant subjective aims and conditions (e.g., resentment, hostility, fear, and the subjective means of coping with these psychological states). The logical inconsistency between the subjective and objective aims may be explained by certain psychological mechanisms, as for example, displacement of feeling from its original object to other objects, or the projections of subjective aims on external objects.

"This type of analysis and research extends the clarifying and consistency-producing rôle of science from the objective dimension in which overt expression and action are taken as given into the realm of the subjective origin and meaning of values."

It was recognized, however, that inquiries into the "functions" performed by evaluations, and into the psychological "origin" of evaluations, do not by themselves lead to a decision on the rank of values. We are making no final statement on the presence or absence of a certain star in the skies by revealing that the motive of the astronomer who claimed its discovery had been pure ambition or the lust to impress the girl he loved.

There followed a discussion of a suitable *research program* regarding purposes and values in political science.[9] This part of the proceedings cannot be included in the present report. But it should be mentioned that these discussions testified to the great amount of fruitful work that can be performed on a strictly scholarly basis through analysis of the meaning and implications of purposes and evaluations, and of their origin and functions.

III. THE SCHOLAR AS A TEACHER[10]

Regarding the desirable behavior of the scholar, both as teacher and

[9] Points three and four of the agenda.

[10] This was point five of the agenda.

scientific writer, the relativists have left the gates wide open on two different roads. They have told us that we may choose to be either neutral relativists or partisan relativists—either try to be neutral as far as man can be neutral, or, if we so desire, take sides. The only thing relativists demand that we do in the second event is that we tell our audience that we *are* taking sides without being able to offer intersubjective proof of the validity of our assumptions. What our unproved and unprovable assumptions are, they say, we should clearly state. Otherwise, we violate our duties as scholars.

Most speakers agreed with these views. "In view of the subjective elements that enter into our values, the scientific spirit requires that our preferences be made clear in our teaching, research, and writing," said Mr. Lippincott, adding:

"Certainly the student is entitled to know the point of view from which data are selected and weighted, just as the fellow-scholar is entitled to know the presuppositions of a study. Making known one's preferences or value-judgments can, of course, be done in different ways, and often just as effectively indirectly as directly. But this should not prevent the theorist from taking part in practical affairs."[11]

Mr. Almond made a strong case for neutrality:

"The academic function is an 'office' in the sense of the term quite similar to the bureaucratic usage. When one is in one's office, one acts in terms of the powers, duties, and privileges of the office. A scientific office implies neutrality, since science itself is neutral. Advocacy, avowed or concealed, is a kind of scientific *ultra vires* action. Nor is the advocacy of radicalism justified as a 'means of balancing' the conservative pressure on the scientific enterprise. The place to combat political pressure on science is the political arena, and not on the academic platform.[12]

"It is certainly not appropriate in the class-room, particularly at the college level, to discuss political ideologies in terms of 'better or worse.' In a society swept by the winds and cross-winds of propaganda, the class-room is the one refuge which is ruled by the spirit of detached inquiry and dispassionate investigation. To achieve such a spirit and tone necessarily implies some sacrifice on the part of the teacher and the student of the pleasant self-indulgence of 'letting down one's hair' and speaking 'from the heart.'

"This is certainly no more of a sacrifice than that which is required of the modern laborer, bureaucrat, business man, and the like, who must seek the gratification of their impulses toward wholeness and creativeness outside of the routines of their occupations. Those of us who are incapable of

[11] See next section.
[12] See next section.

accepting the discipline of the modern division of labor can choose other occupations. There are many in which the demands are less exacting, where advocacy is a part of the function itself—journalism, politics, pressure group jobs, etc."

On the other hand, Mr. Almond suggested that "possibly the extreme school of neutrality in scientific exposition takes itself a little too seriously in assuming that the young or that laymen are such tender shoots as will sway in the slightest wind of advocacy."

Partisanship in favor of "all that is good in humanity" was demanded by Mr. Hallowell. He said:

"An individual is not a part-time scientist, a part-time citizen, and a part-time man, but always and in every capacity a human being. As a human being endowed by his Creator with reason, he has not only the right but the responsibility to use his reason to discover what is good for man and to teach it and to practice it. An individual cannot help being a partisan in favor of all that is good for humanity.

"The first and foremost obligation of the scholar and the teacher is to seek the truth wherever found and to defend it with reason. That truth will include truths about good and evil, justice and injustice. The scholar and teacher does have an obligation to explain the principles in terms of which he discovers the truth and to defend those principles by rational argument. If he is willing to reason, there is no danger that he will be dogmatic.

"Students are impatient, and rightly so, with an 'objectivity' that refrains from decisions. 'Objectivity' parading too often under the thin disguise of tolerance is more often than not a confession of despair or a cloak for indifference. It is a healthy sign of intellectual curiosity and moral integrity that students are demanding answers. They do not and should not expect all answers to be the same, but they do expect the scholar and the teacher, whose superior knowledge and training they respect, to tell them what in his opinion is true and right, and why. If he answers that he does not know what is true or right, can we blame them if the students turn to demagogues who will all too willingly supply the answers? It was the abdication of such responsibility on the part of many of the academic profession in Germany that drove many university students into the ranks of the Nazis."

There was, of course, agreement that the scholar is to "seek the truth wherever found and to defend it with reason," and that he has to "explain the principles in terms of which he discovers the truth." In doing just that, however, he will, it was contended, be compelled, if honest, to make clear which of his statements he is able to prove intersubjectively and which he rests only on subjective conviction. The remaining differences between Mr. Hallowell and the relativists have their root in differences

of opinion (as discussed above) about what *can* be proved by reason, rather than about the responsibility of the scholar. The formula "what is good for man" implies, it was argued, the entire range of the problems connected with the meaning of good and the equality of men. If made more articulate, it could hardly be presented as a scientifically self-evident basis of all scholarly work, although scholars will generally agree that their work has not to be directed toward the good of some individuals only.

The chairman suggested that the chief difficulty lay in the overlapping of two different functions—education and scholarly work. The purpose of education is in many respects much broader than that of scholarly work, though narrower in others. He thought it advisable to distinguish between work done with groups of pre-scholarly age and with such of scholarly age.

"Pupils in pre-scholarly age groups should be educated in fundamental democratic ideals, such as respect for the dignity of man and tolerance, regardless of the limits to scientific demonstrability. It is not necessary even to point to these limits in this stage of education. It is sufficient to present the consequences of non-democratic practices to the ethical judgment of the class. According as the pupils advance in age, it may be appropriate to warn them that their deepest ethical feelings are based on an urge the source of which is beyond scientific arguments, and to admonish them to be the more respectful toward this urge. But such philosophical insertions need not detract from unwavering education in the spirit of fundamental democratic ideals.

"But any scholarly work done with students in scholarly age groups should be marked by a decisive difference in this respect. It should be based on scholarly methods, and the limitations inherent in scholarly work should, therefore, constitute an ever-present factor. Contemporary attempts to break through or push back the narrow walls that encircle science in value questions should be treated intensively. But students should be kept on the alert regarding the difference between attempts at interpersonal demonstration and subjective proposals of ethical self-determination.

"This does not prevent the scholar-teacher from making proposals of ethical self-determination to any extent compatible with his educational functions. Education in democratic countries should require that students be made thoroughly familiar with the best arguments forwarded by great scholars and religious philosophers in favor of respect for the dignity of man, such as Kant's argument and the argument derived from the impossibility of *disproving* this fundamental claim. Students should be trained to defend democratic ideals well and with scientifically impeccable arguments in discussions with opponents who believe in other ideals, and to beware of fallacious platitudes that can be turned against them in the

discussion. They should, of course, also be made familiar with the arguments offered by anti-democratic ideologies; but first of all they should learn to use the pro-democratic arguments on the highest scholarly level of discussion.

"It must be left to the individual scholar, or to the individual institution, whether to base scholarly discussions on impartial neutrality in value matters, or on certain specific assumptions, or on a systematic dedication of the entire institution to intensive work based on the assumption of or the belief in certain ideals. But assumptions should always be clearly stated."

IV. THE SCHOLAR IN PRACTICAL POLITICS[13]

There seemed to be general agreement that the scholar may take part in practical politics. Mr. Lippincott said:

"He *must* take part if he hopes to understand politics. For political theories are dynamic. The principles, for example, that must be developed to defeat Communist infiltration into a trade union or a political party can hardly be worked out by sitting behind a desk in a study. The knowledge of Marxism must be supplemented by a knowledge of how it is carried out in practice. Answers to problems such as these may mean the difference between maintaining or losing democracy."

Mr. Almond commented:

"Away from his academic office, the scientist is affected by the rules applicable to political debate rather than those referring to scientific work. Even on the platform, however, he is still a scientist and must respect the canons of scientific method. But there he may speak as a 'whole man,' with all the heat which the subject-matter may evoke in him."

Mr. Hallowell stressed that the scholar should not only seek and teach the truth, but also practice it. There was agreement that the scholar, entering practical politics, may make important contributions to the fight of ideologies. The chairman suggested that scholars should urge democratic statesmen to make full use of appeals to the "inescapable" elements in human ethical feelings, as discussed earlier, because one can always be sure of a response to such arguments, even in foreign nations living under a different régime. For the same reason, diplomatic language should emphasize the impossibility of reaching certain goals by certain means. He further submitted the following suggestions for the ideological struggle:

"The United States should always be outspoken in emphasizing fundamental democratic principles, such as respect for the dignity of man, even when practical concessions must be made to avoid war.

"Secondly, United States foreign policy should discard the principle of absolute respect for national sovereignty whenever minimum standards

[13] This was point six of the agenda.

of respect for the dignity of man are systematically violated by a country's government. The fact that intervention may be impracticable should never lead to recognition of the scientifically and practically objectionable doctrine that, because of the allegedly higher principle of sovereignty, such intervention is fundamentally unjustified. Sovereignty should be considered not a higher but a lower principle in such cases.

"Thirdly, the United States should try to implement its humanitarian foreign policy by urging all countries to establish minimum standards of justice in their domestic constitutions in an 'emergency-proof' manner and to place the preservation of these standards under supranational, quasi-federal institutions, such as supranational supreme courts, on either a regional or a global basis or both."

Lack of time prevented further discussion of these points. When asked whether they were in line with scholarly neutrality, the speaker said that avowedly they were not; but he pleaded that this last point of the debate asked for contributions of scholars under definite assumptions—struggle for basic ideals of right and justice—and that the scholar's conscientious participation in this struggle was essential for advance Beyond Relativism.

UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION IN POLITICAL SCIENCE*

I. THE INTRODUCTORY COURSE IN GOVERNMENT

FRANCIS O. WILCOX
Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress

Introductory Comments. How and what to teach has been one of the most engaging topics of conversation in political science circles for many years. Yet it is a remarkable fact that not a single department of political science in the United States, so far as the writer is aware, offers its graduate students a seminar on teaching problems.[1] Seemingly we have been content with the old formula for teaching success: "If you would be a good teacher, saturate yourself with your subject-matter and teach like hell." Unfortunately, some of our teachers have done just that.

If we needed to reëvaluate our teaching before the war, it is imperative now that a little individual and collective soul-searching be done. The tremendous changes ushered in by the war and the uncertainties of the future emphasize more than ever the importance of our work. The world is entering a new era in which democracy will be put to real test as it continues to meet the challenge of more militant ideologies. It will be an era of bewildering social change accompanied by an increasing awareness of political power on the part of individuals and organized groups. The ideological conflict will be characterized by tension between management and labor at home and the old familiar pattern of power politics—with new forms of nationalism and militarism—in our relations abroad. Students will be bombarded with propaganda from every quarter. Freedom of speech may be difficult. There will be a genuine concern over the re-defi-

* The reports here presented on teaching problems in political science grew out of a series of round tables held in Washington during the war years, and were prepared by an editorial board of the American Political Science Association's Committee on Undergraduate Instruction. While they were submitted to Committee members for comment and criticism, responsibility for preparing them rested with the editorial board, and they do not necessarily reflect the views of all members of the Committee. The reports are of a preliminary character, being designed primarily to stimulate further discussion of important problems in the teaching field. Members of the Committee during the past year included: Francis O. Wilcox (*chairman*), Charles Aikin, Ethan P. Allen, Herbert W. Briggs, Asher N. Christensen, Finla G. Crawford, Royden J. Dangerfield, Marshall E. Dimock, Harold M. Dorr, James W. Fesler, George A. Graham, John Russell, Harvey C. Mansfield, Roscoe C. Martin, Charles McKinley, John D. Millett, Victoria Schuck, John A. Vieg, Robert A. Walker, Benjamin F. Wright, and Charles G. Post.

[1] The University of Michigan will offer such a course next year. I am also informed that Syracuse University has offered one for some years, although it deals mainly with evaluation techniques.

nition of democracy in terms of contemporary life, and students will demand a more practical, realistic education than they have had in the past.

Meantime many old problems in government will assume new proportions as a result of the war. Taxation and public finance, housing, consumer problems, labor relations, national defense, the conduct of foreign relations, federal-state relations, executive-legislative relations, regionalism, the political process, public opinion, the relationship of government to business and to the individual—these are a few of the problem areas that are looming large. Teachers of government will be confronted with the double responsibility of helping to reinterpret these phenomena in the light of new conditions and of developing an informed citizenry which, through intelligent participation in the democratic process, will be able to meet the perplexing challenges of a new age.

In suggesting that a little *collective* soul-searching is in order, I do not mean to imply that individual instructors should rest on their oars. Nevertheless, after years of hit-and-miss methods, it would seem high time for the members of the American Political Science Association to adopt more effective methods of exchanging ideas about teaching problems and to inaugurate joint studies of common problems which perplex teachers of government everywhere. With this general objective in mind, it is the purpose of this paper to present some of the leading questions which should be re-examined and the action which might be taken with respect to the introductory course.

By the introductory course, I mean the elementary course in government normally offered to freshmen and sophomores in colleges and universities. While the course varies in length and content, it appears in the catalogues of most institutions as a study of American national, state, and local government. In considering this problem, however, there are two possible lines of development which must be kept in mind: (1) the re-examination and reorganization of the introductory course in government; and (2) the development of a broader social science course designed to supplement, or even replace, the introductory course. In view of the importance of this second possibility, I have felt it desirable to comment upon it at some length.

These two lines of development—the minimum and the maximum—are by no means mutually exclusive. Certainly a one-year social science course (six to eight semester hours) would not obviate the need for a basic course in government. On the other hand, if a two-year social science program is offered, most of the basic essentials can be covered and no elementary course in government would seem necessary. In view of the wide variety of programs found in our colleges and universities, it would be helpful to make progress along both lines simultaneously in various institutions.

At the outset, it is imperative that steps be taken to raise the prestige value of the introductory course to a position commensurate with its place in the college curriculum. It is by far the most important course offered by the department; it is, in many ways, the most difficult to teach. It must not, therefore, be turned over to the younger instructors and graduate assistants and neglected by the more seasoned staff members. It deserves a great deal of time and attention and, above all, it deserves the best teaching talent the department can afford.

What Should be the Objectives of the Introductory Course? When one goes into a ticket office, he has to know where he wants to go—including the route he wishes to take and the stop-overs he wishes to make—before he can buy his ticket. Most teachers have not been so concerned about their destination when they begin the introductory course. Too often the main objective is to cover the textbook in the allotted time. No doubt our teaching would be improved if we would (1) define in advance the objectives we hope to achieve in the course; (2) adapt our approach and subject-matter to enable us best to reach the objectives; (3) devise evaluation methods to determine in what ways we fail to attain our objectives; and (4) revise the course accordingly.

During the war, the Navy training program geared its courses to a strictly limited objective, namely, to teach the trainees in the shortest possible time the skills and abilities needed to do their specific jobs. Billet analysis experts went on shipboard and recorded exactly what signalmen, gunners, and others were required to do in combat and in normal cruising conditions. In the light of these findings, curricula for training programs were constructed and constantly revised. Much of the material offered in certain courses was eliminated because it did not contribute directly to attaining the objectives agreed upon. By doing away with these intellectual detours, the Navy instructor was able to take the most direct route possible to his goal.

Obviously, the goal of the teacher of the introductory course cannot be so clearly defined. He must have in mind the objectives of general education, the objectives of his own institution, and the needs of his particular group of students. No one would argue that the introductory course ought to be served in the same dish regardless of whether the banquet is being held at Pomona, Purdue, Columbia, Kansas State, or the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

On one point we can speak out unequivocally. Most of the students who take the introductory course will not take another course in political science, and many of them will not take another course in *any* social science. On the other hand, practically all students who major in political science will start their political science training with this course. As between these two groups, our obligations are clear. The introductory course,

in the first instance, should be designed to meet the needs of the great mass of students on the campus who may soon become responsible citizens. This paramount objective should not be compromised in order to cater to the particular needs of potential political science majors. Every year we have an opportunity to encourage thousands of budding dentists, doctors, engineers, and scientists into the paths of good citizenship. We ought to make the most of it.

We all agree that the objectives of the introductory course will vary somewhat depending upon the nature of the institution, the make-up of the class, and the temperament of the instructor. In general, however, it ought to be designed primarily to accomplish the following: (a) to give the student that general body of knowledge about government and public affairs that will help him become an effective citizen; (b) to develop a broad understanding of the workings of the American constitutional system; (c) to encourage an understanding and appreciation of the democratic way of life; (d) to develop the student's ability to observe and analyze and form well-considered judgments about government and public affairs; (e) to develop sound methods of investigation and reflection and the ability to evaluate information; (f) to stimulate active interest and participation in civic affairs; (g) to make clear the rôle that individuals and organized groups can play in the political process; and (h) to demonstrate the relationship of the study of government and public affairs to the other social sciences.[2]

In general, I think we can agree that there ought to be less and less emphasis on facts and historical details, and more and more on developing certain interests and attitudes of mind, the ability to interpret facts and ideas, and to think critically. The dominating objective should be to encourage an appreciation of the nature and value of popular government—what difference it makes whether we have it or not—what the alternatives are—what institutions would seem to be essential for its preservation. If instructors can make real progress toward this goal, we can forgive many sins.

In the long run, of course, we should aim at more than a mere understanding of democracy. What we want is a willingness to take action in order to preserve and perfect it. For knowledge, unless it is the gateway to more intelligent living, is like the parsley on a baked ham—for decorative purposes only. We must, therefore, do everything within our power to personalize the course, to bring it down out of the clouds and make it meaningful in terms of the every-day lives of our students.

[2] One committee member considered this list of objectives too comprehensive. It would seem, however, that most general education courses should have at least one or two objectives in each of the following areas: (1) acquisition of information; (2) critical thinking; (3) development of study skills; and (4) interests and attitudes.

One final word should be said about objectives. Many teachers who were associated with the government during the war are convinced that if students are to gain a real appreciation of the democratic process, the teaching of government must be made more realistic, more human, more dynamic. We cannot all take our classes to Washington. But we must do our best to bring Washington, as it actually functions, to our classes. The hiatus between the textbook and the laboratory must be bridged.

This war-time development merely reëmphasizes the genuine need for the teaching profession to keep from operating in an intellectual vacuum. It reëmphasizes the desirability of teachers retaining continuing relations with local, state, and national agencies and with international organizations, either as consultants, as part-time staff members, or as interested observers. It reëmphasizes, too, the desirability of establishing coöperative ventures between government and higher education whereby an agency like the State Department might invite a number of instructors each year to serve as temporary members of its staff. Such an arrangement would result in a cross-fertilization of ideas and would be mutually beneficial.

Meanwhile, the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction, in collaboration with the American University and the District of Columbia Political Science Association, is planning to inaugurate a series of two-week seminars in Washington for the benefit of the younger members of the profession. Arrangements will be made for the group to observe the Congress, the Supreme Court, and the various departments of the executive branch in action, and discussion groups will be held with leading national figures. An attempt will be made to present an intimate picture of how the government functions at the national level.

What Changes Should be Made in the Content of the Introductory Course? Assuming that there can be a meeting of minds on the general objectives, what subject-matter offers the best road for reaching these objectives? A survey of comparative government? A study of the organization and functioning of American government at the national, state, and local levels? A description of the organization and functioning of American national government? An examination of the main theories or ideologies relating to the use and control of political power—such as communism, fascism and democracy? A legalistic study of the state? A functional approach? Or perhaps a general orientation of all levels of government from local to international?

It would be difficult to prove that any one of these subject-matter roads is a more direct route or is paved with better concrete than the others. A competent teacher might reach his goal satisfactorily regardless of which one he decides to take. In fact, he might find it profitable to travel some distance over several of the roads. In that event, the question becomes very largely one of determining the time and emphasis to be placed on

different topics so that a satisfactory balance can be achieved. But let us be more specific. For the sake of argument, let us take the traditional course dealing with American national, state, and local government. What changes in respect to subject-matter should be made? I have received specific suggestions from many teachers of government throughout the United States. Here are a few of them which have fairly wide support.

In the first place, there is general agreement that the course ought to be concerned less and less with legal technicalities and more and more with broader problems of public policy. There ought to be less of history and more of political science; less of structure and more of function; less of facts as such and more of what the facts mean. There ought to be less space in the average text devoted to the details of government procedure and more devoted to the nature of democracy.

In the second place, there is a strong conviction that most students in the introductory course do not receive a satisfactory picture of the administrative process. The tendency of text writers to catalogue the activities of the federal government, to list in a detailed way the organization and the functions of the different agencies, departments, and bureaus, has the effect of overwhelming and confusing the student. Clearly, the detailed description of agencies is the kind of information that ought to be reserved for the government manual. What the average citizen needs to know, in broad terms, is the nature of the problems the agency faces, and how it actually operates to meet those problems, particularly with respect to its relations with the Congress, the President, the courts, state and local governments, and pressure groups.

Under the circumstances, it is not surprising when many students complain that administration is the least inspiring part of the entire course. Yet we know that administration, far from being cold and lifeless, is in fact a study in human relationships, coöperative action, and dynamic leadership. As such, it is full of warmth and vitality. What we, as teachers, must do is to reveal the people behind the charts and demonstrate that we have a government of human beings as well as a government of laws. We would do much to reinvigorate the course if we could portray the administrative side of the story of government as a dramatic story of problems, processes, and personalities.

In the third place, it must be apparent that we have neglected to give adequate attention to the concept of democracy. We speak at great length about the electoral process, the legislature in action, the Constitution, the courts, and the executive, but nowhere do we pause to ponder the real meaning of democracy. Yet here, it seems to me, is the all-important question. What is democracy? What are its weaknesses? Wherein lies its strength? What are its chances to survive? What is the real nature of the

alternatives to democracy?[3] It is infinitely more important for a student to think about these questions than it is for him to know the steps a bill must go through before it can become a law.

Equally perplexing is our failure to deal with public opinion. Can any one pretend to know how government functions, either in a democracy or a totalitarian state, if he is not aware of the nature of public opinion and how it is formulated? Can any one argue that an understanding of the rôle of the press, the motion picture, the radio, the church, and the schools in our governmental system is less important than a knowledge of the electoral college? Yet most of our texts avoid a systematic discussion of public opinion as they would the plague.

These sins of omission are the results of an intellectual hangover from by-gone years. They represent a natural text-book lag which is the fault of the instructor-consumer even more than of the textbook writers. For when an acceptable subject-matter pattern has been worked out for a course it becomes difficult—yes, even painful—to discard last year's lecture notes in order to utilize a new approach. Consequently, both the writers and the publishers know that any book which departs very far from the beaten path will probably be an unprofitable venture.

Such sins of omission may be found in practically every area of American government. Take political parties, for example. The history of the bi-party system is both interesting and important. But what about the actual functioning of the party machine? What about the nature and the activities of the American politician? What about such problems as the value of political compromise in a democracy? What about a consideration of the ways and means by which, both individually and in groups, citizens can participate effectively in party politics? These are questions which all students of government ought to explore.

Of even greater urgency now is the need for a proper consideration of government at the international level. At the very least, in a course devoted primarily to training for citizenship, a survey of the structure and functions of the United Nations would seem imperative. Given the relationship of public opinion to world peace, it would be nothing short of criminal if freshmen and sophomores were not given the opportunity to study world problems and world government. The responsibility for affording them such an opportunity falls squarely upon the political science department.

"But," some people will argue, "if we introduce so much new material,

[3] These questions, I believe, can best be answered by a brief excursion of from two to three weeks into political theory and comparative government so that democratic ideals and principles can be compared with fascist and communist ideologies.

how can we give adequate treatment to state and local government?" This is not a convincing argument. For years, students and teachers alike have complained that the study of government at the national, state, and local levels often involves a considerable amount of monotonous overlapping and repetition. My own inclination, therefore, would be to reduce drastically the amount of time given to state and local government *as such* and devote that time to other hitherto neglected problems.

If the traditional course is to be retained, such revisions as those indicated above would seem to constitute the bare minimum in the way of change. I am not arguing for an entirely new approach. The familiar pattern of the Constitution, the President, political parties, the Congress, the courts, and the executive branch has its merits. It affords the student something tangible to grasp, and is perhaps easier to comprehend than a more abstract approach. The old framework, rehabilitated by a few relatively minor surgical operations and reinvigorated by a few blood transfusions, can possibly be reshaped to meet our changing objectives.[4] The suggestions which have been made above, merely by way of example, indicate that a comprehensive study of the whole problem is in order.

The Social Science Course. So much for the minimum that should be done. What about the maximum? In recent years there has been a growing feeling in many quarters that a broad social science course offers a more effective introduction to the study of government than the standard course in American government. In a few institutions, as at Chicago, the social science course has replaced the introductory course. In others, it has been used to supplement the existing curriculum. But in nearly all cases—whether it be a citizenship course, a simple survey of political science, economics, and sociology, a social problems course, a study of the community, an analysis of the major institutions of modern society, or a combination of several of these approaches, the major objective remains essentially the same, namely, to give the student an over-all picture of the social sciences without regard to artificial subject-matter boundary lines.

One may well question the wisdom of steering the student directly into the elementary economics, sociology, and government courses. Take political science, for example. With the background afforded by a good social science course, it becomes possible for the student to study government with the whole social scene as his frame of reference. Is it not more logical to examine the problem of constitutional revision *after* he has been introduced to the broader concept of social change? Or to study the conduct of American foreign policy *after* he has examined the nature of the state system within which our policy is formulated and executed?

[4] It is my argument that the objectives outlined above can be reached by means of a revised American government course. With this argument, one committee member vigorously disagrees. "The old nag is cancerous," he writes, "and a few blood transfusions are not going to save it. Major surgery is in order."

As I have said, the main advantage of the social science approach is that it cuts across departmental lines to select those relevant materials which will demonstrate the essential unity of life and of learning. It should enable the student better to understand government in its true perspective—as one of several interrelated disciplines each of which, without the aid of the others, is able to illuminate in only an incomplete way the world in which he lives. It not only avoids a piecemeal approach; it also eliminates the traditional departmental labels with which the subject-matter of the social sciences has been so persistently tagged.

Moreover, the objections which have been raised against the social science course are not fundamental. The criticism, for example, that the course is "too thin" is certainly not valid, although the simple survey in which representatives from the economics, sociology, and political science departments present in turn the basic essentials of their disciplines may result in certain important topics being superficially treated. The superficiality of a course depends upon the selection and presentation of subject-matter, and those in charge of a social science course may cut deeply into relatively few topics in order to achieve their objectives if they choose to do so. Even in a survey course, it is not necessary to survey everything.

Likewise the argument that it is difficult to find appropriate readings or teachers with broad enough backgrounds is not too convincing. Naturally, the proper planning and presentation of such a course is a large order. It means the mastering, in part, of several fields. It means keeping up with ever-expanding sources of materials. It involves the ability to make clear relationships in various areas of learning. But, given extra time and energy on the part of the staff, it can be done.

It is argued also that the social science course tends to place the emphasis upon the weaknesses, the sore-spots, of modern society—thus imparting to the student a cynical, hypercritical point of view. This criticism, which is directed more at the social problems course, likewise applies to some of our debunking teachers of political science. Any course in the social sciences, if conducted in a negative, destructive way, will certainly contribute to a feeling on the part of students that the world is in such a mess that it is useless to do anything about it. Skepticism, disillusionment, and mental flabbiness may be the result. But in the long run, it is not the subject-matter approach as much as it is the attitude of the teacher which will determine whether a course will have positive or negative results.

In connection with the social science course, two important questions inevitably arise. Who will do the course planning and who will teach it? It is, I think, highly desirable to place a single instructor in charge of each class so that he may cover the entire year's work with his group and act as the integrating factor for them, even if other teachers are invited to share in the classroom instruction. Here is a case where too many highly

specialized cooks may fail to turn out a balanced meal. On the other hand, if a proper balance is to be maintained, specialists from various disciplines should share in the *planning* of the course. Observation at many institutions has shown, for example—if we may change the figure of speech—that when the sociologist writes the prescription the final product may be too heavily weighted with juvenile delinquency, folkways, and the use of leisure time. Whether such medicine would cure the patient or produce a slight touch of nausea depends on one's point of view. In any event, the selection and arrangement of course materials, the determination of readings and assignments, and the preparation of examinations ought to be a *joint* project.

It is highly significant that many teachers who have constructed and taught a broad introductory course in the social sciences are enthusiastic about its potentialities. The criticisms come mainly from those doubting Thomases who know little or nothing about it. The future of such a course in the colleges, however, will depend in large measure upon the foresight and thoroughness with which the high schools tackle the problem. If they can meet the need, we should defer to them. In any event, it is important that our program should be closely integrated with current developments in the high school system.

Instructional Methods. In our deep concern over subject-matter, we must not underestimate the importance of developing and improving our teaching techniques. Indeed I am radical enough to believe that a little team-work between the political scientists and the professional educators would be mutually beneficial. The educators have conducted many useful studies in evaluation, interdepartmental coördination, and teaching techniques in general. Yet without our knowledge of subject-matter they are forced to work, to a certain extent, in the dark. And without their basic interest in pedagogy to spur us on, we may go plodding along a generation behind the times.

There is one problem in particular which should give us pause—our slowness to utilize laboratory methods in political science. It is a false assumption that the physicist and the chemist must resort to laboratory exercises to demonstrate the basic principles of their disciplines while the social scientist need not do so. Listening to lectures may be helpful. But well-organized trips to legislative chambers, court-rooms, and polling-places undoubtedly give young people a much more vivid understanding of their society and a much keener appreciation of it.

Such a program would require more planning, more manpower, more money. Up to the present, however, continued pressure by natural science departments has resulted in the expenditure of an undue portion of university budgets for microscopes, test tubes, and atom smashers, with only the crumbs left for the social scientist. We must develop a program worthy

of our objectives and then move in on the administrators for our full share of the loaf. Meanwhile, even though the present inflated size of classes makes the organized use of community resources extremely difficult, we can still make arrangements for individual students to visit the city hall, the state legislature, and other points of interest.

Moreover, we must never forget that the campus itself offers a valuable laboratory where many practical lessons in democracy can be learned. Numerous opportunities can be given students to aid in planning, organizing, and executing all kinds of curricular and extra-curricular activities. One example, apart from student government, which can be utilized much more effectively than now may suffice. Some years ago, the writer was in charge of three classes covering the same subject-matter. A group of nine students—three elected from each section—constituted the planning committee for the course. It was the function of this committee, meeting with the instructional staff, to voice the sentiments of their classes, criticize course procedure, recommend desired changes, and so on. This arrangement proved an excellent tonic for class morale. It not only made students feel they had a real hand in planning and conducting the class; it also resulted in worth-while improvements in the course.

Lack of space makes it impossible to discuss the many instructional devices with which the teacher of the beginning course might profitably experiment.[5] The success of these techniques will depend upon such variables as the nature of the course, the make-up of the class, and the personality of the instructor. In any event, such questions as the following might well be raised: Have we fully exploited novels, short stories, biographies, and plays as a source of interesting reading about government and politics? Can critical essay writing, perhaps in collaboration with the English department, be used more effectively? To what extent can films, slides, graphs, and charts be used to make the course more interesting? How far should we go in arranging for students actually to participate in politics or civic affairs? Have round tables, panels, and discussion groups been used to the best possible advantage? Is it feasible to encourage interdepartmental collaboration with respect to the course?

One final word should be said about evaluation. In this area, our progress has been woefully inadequate. For the most part, the tests we have used have been designed largely to determine whether the students are to be given a failing or a passing mark. We should now move on to the task of constructing reliable diagnostic tests which will measure such things as interests and attitudes of mind, study skills, and ability to think critically. With the aid of such tests, we can measure our teaching effec-

[5] One committee member feels strongly that the lecture method and the textbook must both be eliminated—that we should use "important original writings and the seminar method."

tiveness with respect to each of our objectives, and then proceed to ferret out our weaknesses so that we may take those steps necessary to make our course really effective.

Concluding Comments. From what has been said, it is apparent that much can be done to inject new life and vitality into the beginning course. Given the present world situation and the kaleidoscopic changes taking place in government, this should be done *now*. It would be most unfortunate if, on account of the present pressure of crowded classrooms and heavy teaching loads, real progress should have to be postponed until something like normalcy returns to the college campus.

In this important task, the American Political Science Association can do much to help. It can encourage a joint consideration and definition of major objectives and a careful review of course content. It can facilitate an interchange among political scientists of course outlines, reading lists, examinations, and teaching techniques. It can study the possible uses of available films, slides, charts, and graphs, and lay plans for the production of new ones. It can make a similar study of evaluation techniques. It can enter into closer working relations with the National Council for the Social Studies, the American Economic Association, and other national organizations interested in the social sciences. It can do much to stimulate good teaching and to secure for good teachers the professional recognition they deserve.

Events of the past two decades have demonstrated again with terrible clarity the truth of Comte's maxim that "ideas rule the world or throw it into chaos." With this in mind, we should move now to make the introductory course a more vital and dynamic force in the lives of our college students.

II. THE MAJOR IN POLITICAL SCIENCE*

HARVEY C. MANSFIELD
Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

A requirement of subject-matter concentration—generally to the extent of two full-year courses or their equivalent in the student's annual budget of four or five—during the last two years of the undergraduate curriculum is common to the great majority of colleges and universities granting liberal arts degrees. It complements a requirement of diversification that is also commonly prescribed as a restriction on the freedom students otherwise would have to concentrate still further in their choices among course offerings. Together, the two embody a philosophy of balance in the

* The members of the Committee did not have opportunity to read and express themselves on this article.

distribution of studies; but they do not define the scope or content of any particular area of concentration.

The requirement of a "major" applies equally to a wide variety of fields of study, in the humanities and the natural as well as the social sciences. The aims and problems of the major in political science, therefore, are in large measure those of the major as such. They merge, indeed, into the broader question of the general goals of college education in the upper-class years, since the major figures so importantly in the work of juniors and seniors. They focus on two points chiefly: (1) the course content, or area, of the major in political science, and (2) the ways and means of instruction within the major, to the end of deepening its educational value. Put more briefly, the problems are what to learn and how to learn in the area of principal interest. On both these points, the initiative in formulating policy belongs to the faculties concerned.

We do not, naturally, have an altogether free hand to fashion the answers. In any particular case, their local coloring and configuration, at least, are likely to be governed by the peculiarities of the subject-matter, or of the institution, or of the clientele. Each of these has a bearing.

I

If there is not theoretical agreement over the proper content of the field of political science, there is at least a good deal of uniformity of behavior among faculties in the offerings of courses under that heading in the catalogue. A four-fold grouping is a standard pattern: (1) something of political theory, whether the approach is analytical or historical; (2) courses in comparative government, ordinarily confined to nations of Western Europe and of the British Commonwealth, with passing gestures to the east and occasionally to the south; (3) courses in international relations, embracing the legal framework, political processes, and dominant motivations of the conduct of foreign affairs and international government; and (4) a plethora of courses in American government, broken down on an area basis into national, state, and local, and functionally into politics, public opinion, parties, and legislation; constitutional and administrative law; public administration (this in turn susceptible of minute subdivision); business regulation; etc. Courses organized on a problem approach, such as civil liberties, regional planning, or crisis government, may cut across these categories. How can a student "concentrate" on this array of specialties? He may spread his four courses so as to include one from each of the four groups, or in many universities he could take all four in American government without exhausting the resources of the faculty. Plainly, no single pattern of choice among the available permutations emerges to define automatically the content of the major. On the face of it, there are majors to be taken in international relations, in Ameri-

can government, or in personnel administration, as plausibly as in "political science."

Concentration and diversification are fuzzy concepts in themselves. Does concentration denote more than the restriction of attention to a limited area? Even by that standard, concentration on four broad courses such as American government, the history of political thought, European political institutions, and international politics, is hardly concentration at all. But if a higher degree of intellectual effort is also implied, it does not follow that specialized courses in budgetary procedures, sales taxes, and expenditure controls, for example, necessarily amount to concentration, although all are comprehended under the heading of municipal fiscal administration. And does diversification, by the same token, call only for "survey" courses, or is it satisfied by an aggregation in a student's course of study of miscellaneous fragments, otherwise widely scattered, like the Koran, Belgian ceramics, and the folklore of Tahiti? If the major is to serve a broadly educational purpose, the concentration it provides must aim at the integration of knowledge, the perception of relationships, and the cultivation of mental powers beyond memory.

The problem of choice that arises from specialization is therefore complicated further by the need for recognizing the interdependence of knowledge, and particularly the interrelations of the social sciences. Courses in some branches of economics, psychology, sociology, and history have a valid claim for room in the curriculum of the political science major. If that room is found within the four courses of the major, what room is left? If, instead, the student is encouraged or required to surround his major courses with a selection from these allied fields, what becomes of the principle of diversification? For it can hardly be contended that a course in, say, labor relations, though taught in the economics department, is more remote from the interests of a major in American government than a course in medieval political thought which may be given by a colleague in the political science department. The illustrations can be multiplied. All that can safely be concluded at this point is, first, that the number of indispensable courses must be very small—and justified, if at all, on narrower grounds than the indispensability of their subject-matter; and second, that within the major there exists in a more intense form the same problem of balance between concentration and diversification that attends the choice of courses outside the major.

II

The pattern of the major is vitally affected by the character and resources of the particular college or university. Its traditions and outlook; the size and standing of its faculty, in whole and in its political science and related departments; the leadership of the department; the ratio of stu-

dents to faculty, and of political science majors to others; its emphasis on graduate, professional, or vocational work; the adequacy of its library facilities for individual student investigations; its connections with local governmental bodies or other institutions which may afford opportunities for field work or consultation—these and other like factors largely determine what it is possible to offer to would-be major students, or to require of them.

There must be scores of small colleges whose entire faculty in political science consists of one or two teachers, perhaps with student readers as assistants in these days. Provided the teaching load is proportionate, such a régime may afford the best of opportunities for the mutual probing of ideas, despite restricted physical facilities and a limited range of course offerings that may make it necessary to draw upon several allied departments to fill out the minimum course requirements for the major. Of course, it may also mean only that the designation of a major is merely a bit of formal window dressing for meagre and mediocre goods. And if the teaching load is overpowering, it surely means that intellectual stimulus is worn down under the grinding necessities of scheduled routines.

The degree of vocational emphasis is probably more significant for its effects on the major in larger institutions, unless the vocational training is separately recognized and insulated in an organization apart. Otherwise, the tendency toward an undue proportion of required courses, especially "tool" and descriptive courses covering technical specialties of limited intellectual content, is likely to have a blighting influence on those whose interests are not primarily vocational.

The effect of crushing faculty workloads is a still more serious institutional factor in these times. The trend of student choices, away from the traditional humanities and into the social sciences, that set in so strongly fifteen years ago, and that was attributed then to economic conditions, has apparently been reinforced in the aftermath of World War II. Even at Harvard this year, more students have chosen the field of government for their area of concentration than any other. Inevitably the distribution of faculty manpower among departments lags behind such trends, and the universal and unprecedented increase in enrollments have multiplied faculty burdens. It is idle in these circumstances to indulge schemes of instruction in the major that involve systematic and time-consuming individual student contacts with senior staff members. When upper-class courses that used to draw, say, fifty students are now tripled in size, the basic arithmetic dictates heroic measures.

The staffing pattern within the department is important, too, if the number of major students is relatively large. A department atomistically constructed so that its main weight consists of several more or less coördinate senior staff members makes apt provision for a variety of advanced

lecture courses and seminars, and for a limited number of individual student conferences. It takes on additional majors easily so long as it has unused capacity. It is likely to break down, however, beyond that point, and cannot easily be expanded in the same pattern. Strong guidance exerted to enforce an equalization of the burdens may help temporarily, but this is pretty sure to frustrate both student preferences and faculty habit. It is on the whole a sound impulse among students, within their area of concentration, to insist on access to those they recognize as furnishing the principal intellectual leadership and stimulus in the institution. A pyramidal department, on the other hand, with its center of gravity in the lower ranks, while perhaps more flexibly adaptable to an increasing total workload, deteriorates more quickly in quality of work when confronted with an increase in majors, if the major program involves any considerable proportion of individual conferences.

III

The clientele is compelling, within the range of the choices open to it, when it knows its mind. No doubt the time will return when the choices will be wider, and it will not be enough to satisfy a student that some college, any college, has accepted him for matriculation. But for the present, the sellers' market in education tends to reinforce the effects of the normal condition: most students do not know their minds as to the specific purposes of their education, expect to be advised (if not told) what it is to their best interests to learn, and think indeed that that is a substantial part of what they pay their tuition for. Only a minority know their next goal after graduation in any specific terms. This is perhaps the outstanding immediate fact to be reckoned with in planning the major.

Alongside it is the fact that students today take more seriously than ever the decisions involved in the choices of courses and majors. The testimony is universal that the returned veterans set the tone, that they are more mature, and that they mean business. Accordingly, the major must have a rationale, and it must be conducted in a fashion that brings standards and performance into recognizable relationship. The rationale must accommodate the needs of those who look forward to graduate work and teaching careers in government; to those who expect to be professional practitioners, whether as lawyers or in administration or otherwise; and to those whose interests are not vocational at all and whose goals are no more specific than useful citizenship. These last are much the strongest numerically, and their problem should not be subordinated to the other and easier ones.

Weakening the force of this more serious student interest, however, is the wide range of disparity in student ability and training. Over the past generation, the proportion of the total population of college age actually

going to college has increased to a wholly unprecedented degree. There is good reason to believe that the force of this trend is not spent, in spite of the prospect that federal payments for G.I. education at colleges may be expected to dwindle as the veterans pass out of the college-age brackets, and in spite of recent outrageous increases in tuition at many private institutions. The fact is therefore that the college population has come to approximate more nearly a cross-section of their age group in the nation at large. In the publicly supported institutions at least, this means that the programs for majors must be adapted to the capacities of all who choose to go to college and can survive the scholastic standards of the first two years. They cannot make esoteric demands. In the private institutions that limit enrolments sharply, this factor is perhaps overshadowed, but it cannot be disregarded in very many of them.

On the positive side again, the opportunities for rewarding studies for majors in government, and the challenge to provide them, have never been greater. These arise directly from the great increase in student interest in government, national and international, and the readier availability of a wide variety of materials for study. There is no incentive to effective teaching like a willing pupil.

IV

What can now be said in answer to the questions posed at the beginning of this paper?

The first observation is that the preceding analysis gives little guidance to the specific content of individual courses. I rule that problem out as beyond the scope of the present discussion; it is one to be resolved by the individual instructor in consultation with his department, in the light of too many special circumstances to permit dogmatic prescription, or indeed any adequate treatment in brief compass. Professor Fesler has outlined in general terms for this symposium the content of a course in public administration. I would accept his outline without substantial amendment, while recognizing that other distinguished teachers in the field have organized, or could organize, equally good courses differently.

Next, flexibility must be the keynote also in the provisions governing the students' choices of major courses. For this purpose, some intelligent individual advice is the first need. Only the direst pressures of faculty workload or departmental incompetence should justify permitting students to make their selections without departmental consultation. This is a minimum condition for any rational and systematic planning of major programs. It furnishes the occasion both for an evaluation of the courses available for selection and also for an inventory of the student's previous training, creative capacity, range of interests, and future intentions. The repetition of such consultations across an entering group of students

should develop some standards for recommending patterns of course choices that best fit the institution's resources and the more commonly felt student needs. For the minority of students who have clearly defined goals after graduation and definite preferences among course offerings for their majors, the soundest advice appears to be to honor their preferences. For the rest, the problem is one of steering between extremes of concentration and diversification. In general, the less sharply defined the student's objectives, the greater the emphasis to be placed on diversification; only where his vocational interest is strong and is limited to the specific area of available courses should concentration be encouraged by sharp restrictions on subject-matter selections.

The choice between survey courses and those of a more intensive type for the major involves somewhat different considerations, going nearer the root of the problem of ends and means. It should be plain, in fact, that the question of the area of coverage is not the decisive one for a successful major. Its ultimate success depends rather on devising and using methods of teaching such that, whatever the course content, the student is led to develop his critical and analytical faculties to the end of straight thinking. If the student holds up his end, this can be accomplished by the assignment of individual topics for special papers in a survey course, by appropriate presentation of materials in an advanced course, by discussion and writing in a seminar, or by tutorial work with majors individually outside their regular courses.

The special difficulty with individual papers written in a survey course, for this purpose, is of course the avoidance of purely descriptive essays drawn from limited and secondary or tertiary sources. Unless the assignment necessitates analysis, it loses its reason for being, and by the same token the course loses its claim for inclusion in the major.

The presentation of materials in an advanced course has similar pitfalls. The use of cases in public law courses is an obvious effort, introduced before majors were thought of, to give training in analysis. But in other branches of the field it is not so easy to put the stress on mental effort. There is no automatic progression of difficulty in the subject-matter, such as mathematics and languages offer; it is quite possible to build descriptive and uncritical courses in almost any recondite branch of political science without evoking any greater intellectual problems than the location of books.

Of all the devices for bringing out the fullest possibilities of the major, the most rewarding, in the experience of those who have used it, is tutorial. This calls for individually directed reading, leading at the end of the senior year to a paper or thesis which is the object of a good deal of discussion and is put through several drafts before completion. If this degree of concentration threatens the time allotted for other courses, it can well be

substituted for one of them. If it threatens a proper degree of diversification, a comprehensive examination administered by the department and cutting across courses can protect against that. But it is proper and natural to observe that, as in other matters of education, the best way is an expensive way.

III. UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE

JAMES W. FESLER
University of North Carolina

Along with its obligations to train men and women to serve as useful citizens, to carry on the cultural heritage of the past, and to take their places as productive members of private professions and occupations, the American university recognizes a responsibility to train students for service in federal, state, and local governments. The dimensions of this responsibility are best illustrated by the finding in 1939 that of the men graduates of the University of Minnesota between 1928 and 1936, 41.3 per cent either were or had been in government employment; for the women graduates, the proportion was 66 per cent.[1]

A relatively small proportion of students find their way into the judiciary through the avenue of law-school training and practice of the law. Another small proportion become legislators through a variety of avenues, but with the law schools again predominant in the training. The bulk of university graduates who are public servants will be found in administrative agencies. Consequently, undergraduate training for the public service places its principal emphasis on the training of students to contribute effectively as officers and employees of administrative agencies. The university, therefore, is obligated to acquaint students with the opportunities for administrative service and to guide them into courses that will prepare them for such service.

The political science department, being the department primarily concerned with government, must assume responsibility for stimulating the university to an awareness of its obligations in this field. The department is also generally the best-equipped unit to provide the university with information on the kinds of employment opportunities in the public service, the qualifications that recruiting agencies establish for entry, and the ways in which universities over the country are attempting to meet their responsibilities for training for the public service.

[1] Lloyd M. Short and Gordon O. Pehrson, *A Survey of University Graduates Employed in Government Service* (1939). Although the depression played its part in increasing the relative opportunities for government employment, the figures seem too impressive to be lightly dismissed as evidence of but a passing phenomenon.

However, political science departments must drop any pretense that a political science major is the only, or even the principal, means of entry into the public service. Three types of college graduates can be used in administrative agencies. One is the subject-matter specialist—the man who knows thoroughly such a field as chemistry, engineering, labor economics, public welfare, or law. By far the greatest number of college graduates in the public service are subject-matter specialists. In 1937, the federal professional and scientific employees stationed in Washington could be grouped, in order of numbers, as follows: lawyers, engineers, social scientists (including economists, statisticians, political scientists, and others), physical scientists, agriculturists and biologists, patent examiners, and librarians.[2] The study of University of Minnesota graduates already referred to indicated that in terms of numbers of men graduates in government employment in the 1928–36 period, the colleges and schools ranked as follows: Engineering and Architecture; Education; Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics; Science, Literature, and the Arts; Medicine; Business Administration; Chemistry; Law, and a miscellany of other colleges and schools contributing relatively few graduates to government.[3]

A second type of college graduate used in administrative agencies is the administrative specialist—the man who is privy to the secret lore of budget administration, personnel administration, procedure analysis, records management, or government purchasing. A third type is the administrative generalist—the man who is sufficiently keen-minded, well-informed, energetic, and personable to serve as a general administrator of an operating part of an administrative agency or to serve as a general aide to a top administrator of an administrative agency.

All three types, the subject-matter specialist, the administrative specialist, and the administrative generalist, are sources of recruitment of the few thousand key administrators who direct the administrative work of the federal, state, and local governments. This is often little appreciated, but it is basic to consideration of undergraduate training for public administration. Because administrative agencies are large, there is a constant search for men capable of taking responsibility for segments of an agency's total program. In technical bureaus, it is natural for preference to be shown men already in the organization who combine technical knowledge with administrative ability. Hence, the subject-matter specialists and the administrative specialists are both subject to being called upon to assume administrative posts. The emphasis on specialists is strongest at lower levels of the hierarchy, but extends in some cases to the headship of such major agencies as the Public Health Service, the Weather Bureau, and the

[2] U. S. President's Committee on Civil Service Improvement, *Report* (1941), p. 12.

[3] Lloyd M. Short and Gordon O. Pehrson, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

Soil Conservation Service. Where the function of a unit is not highly technical, or where the technical phases can be handled by assistants to the administrator, or where a premium is put upon having an administrator with a broader vision and greater neutrality than the specialist, an administrative generalist may be put in the key administrative post. The emphasis on generalists is greatest at higher levels of the hierarchy, but can extend down to such subordinate units as the industry and commodity divisions and branches in the Office of Price Administration and War Production Board, where freedom from undue industry influence was an important consideration.

Although this three-lane approach to public service careers needs to be accepted as basic to training for the public service, it is not necessary to make sharp distinctions among training courses for federal, state, and local administration. The recommendations of a report by an International City Managers' Association committee, entitled *Training for Municipal Administration*, do not vary in essentials from the recommendations customarily addressed to the problem of training for federal and state administration.[4]

There is general agreement that a university can best serve the cause of public administration by *not* offering a narrowly vocational undergraduate curriculum in public administration. Such a vocational curriculum would clearly exclude the subject-matter specialists, who must spend most of their time as undergraduates in mastering chemistry, engineering, economics, or other specialties. It would not help the administrative generalist, who must get a liberal education, with emphasis on the social sciences, if he is to be equipped for his future responsibilities as an administrator. The administrative specialist, too, would be put in blinders too early in life if subjected to a series of highly specialized courses that would preclude his taking general courses essential to developing perspective and capacity for growth in the course of his administrative career.

Despite this general agreement on the orientation of undergraduate preparation for public service, there will be on many campuses, particularly of state and municipal institutions, a feeling that such an orientation evades the universities' obligation to train for the public service. Three arguments are made. One is that if undergraduate schools of business administration can train business administrators, there must be an equally sound basis for training public administrators through an undergraduate curriculum of specialized courses. In fact, it is often suggested that the two cases are so much of a kind that the training functions should be combined in a single school of business and public administration. A second argument is that, quite apart from the validity of "vocational"

[4] Of course, the urgency of including a course in national, state, or municipal government varies with the governmental level where employment is expected.

training for public administration, the failure to offer such training results in many undergraduates majoring in schools and departments that do train specifically for jobs to be obtained on graduation. Thereby men are lost to government service who might have directed their work toward such service if the university had offered a clear road to a government job. Third, it is contended that political scientists' insistence on a broad undergraduate training demonstrates that they have not come down to earth; they are engrossed with the training of leaders—men who will rise to top-level administrative posts. Forgotten in this noble vision of a university's training of a handful of leaders is the university's obligation to meet the need for middle-level administrators, for managers of small and medium-sized towns, and for administrative technicians of modest rank.

The response to such questioning of the general approach being taken toward training for the public service must stress the following propositions. The first is that students planning to enter the public service need more than any other group of students a breadth of viewpoint, an appreciation of government's rôle in modern society, and a capacity for leadership that cannot be gained if the multiplication of required public administration courses precludes broad ranging over the fields of the social sciences and the humanities. The second is that governments do recognize the value of broadly trained persons for administrative posts, and have made provision for their recruitment upon graduation and for their specific training in particular duties after they become employees. The third is that the emphasis on a broad foundation and a curricular flexibility for students pointing their work toward the public service does not preclude an emphasis on certain core courses having special value to future administrators. Nor does it mean that the university should disclaim a responsibility for publishing appropriate announcements in its catalogues or for counseling students personally with regard to employment opportunities in the public service and with regard to courses that will best satisfy the students' interests and the government's needs. Finally, those students who have particular promise as future public administrators may appropriately be encouraged to take a year or two of graduate training in the many institutions that now offer such training in public administration. It is at this level that the specifically professional training of future city managers and of state and federal administrators must be concentrated. And such advanced training must itself build on the assumption that the students have acquired a broad foundation at the undergraduate level.

Assuming, then, that the undergraduate curriculum in public administration must include few required courses so as to allow subject-matter specialists to master their subject-matter, and so as to allow future administrative generalists and administrative specialists to get a sound

foundation in the social sciences and the humanities, what are these core courses? The essentials are clear. There should certainly be introductory courses in political science, in economics, and in American history. There should be a basic course in public administration itself. The "tool courses" should be statistics, English composition, and psychology. These seven courses—political science, economics, American history, public administration, statistics, English composition, and psychology—constitute the hard core of any undergraduate training for public administration.[5]

The mere listing of courses can be misleading, for it conceals the important factor of the content and approach of these courses. The statistics course, for example, had better be economic statistics or social statistics, rather than mathematical statistics or psychological statistics. The English composition course, preferably an advanced undergraduate course rather than just the typical freshman course, should emphasize expository writing such as is done in government memoranda and reports, rather than the writing of fiction. The psychology course should focus on problems of human relations rather than on the structure of the eye.

Among other courses that some might wish to consider for inclusion among the required courses, often depending on the content and approach of courses at particular universities, are sociology, anthropology, public speaking, public policy, and political parties and public opinion. Government accounting, which in the past has sometimes been thought appropriate for inclusion, seems of too specialized a value to rank as a required course.

While the core courses will vary in length and in credit units at different institutions, the following observations seem generally applicable. First, the list is short enough so that students majoring in almost any department in the university can obtain the core courses without extending the normal four-year period of undergraduate education.[6] Thus, students in-

[5] One member of the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction differs with this paragraph on two points. First, he feels that the undergraduate curriculum in public administration should include many, rather than few, required courses, as the first two years of college education should be largely prescribed to assure acquisition by the students of the elements of a general education. The writer, on the other hand, has not felt it appropriate in this brief article on a restricted topic to open up the whole subject of freshman and sophomore curricula for a general education.

Second, the Committee member would substitute a logic course for the statistics course, assuming the number of courses is restricted to seven. The argument is that logical analysis is central to the administrator's job, and cannot be provided by employing a logician on the administrator's staff. In contrast, the administrator weak in statistics can turn to a statistician on his staff for aid. The writer grants the argument, but believes that analytical abilities are developed in well-taught courses in the social sciences; statistics, on the other hand, can best be studied in a special course devoted solely to statistics.

[6] This will vary with universities and with subject-matter fields. Engineering,

tending to be subject-matter specialists, administrative specialists, or administrative generalists can all obtain the essential foundation for work in the public service. Political scientists should note the implication: the political science department does not have a monopoly in the training of students for the public service. Almost every department of the university is engaged in such training; and even the core courses do not recognize a majority interest by the political science department.

Second, a number of the required courses would normally form a part of the course of study of students whether they were consciously training for the public service or not. This is particularly true of the introductory political science, economics, and American history courses.

Third, the deliberate avoidance of driving a student down a narrow channel of training for two or three years of his undergraduate career means that the student acquires skills that will be useful in other walks of life if he changes his mind about entering the public service or if employment opportunities in the public service are shut off to him.

The course designed to introduce the student to the field of public administration is crucial to the success of the whole program for undergraduate training for the public service. And heavy demands are placed on the teacher of this course. He should be a reflective political scientist who can penetratingly probe into the fundamental rôle of administration—"bureaucracy" if you please—in democratic government. He should have at hand the factual information needed to describe the principal developments in American public administration—the standard material on development of the civil service system, budgeting and auditing controls, and administrative reorganization—and to speak intelligently of the names and functions of the principal administrative agencies of the government. He should himself have served for a substantial period as an administrative official, preferably in a supervisory position—or have been driven by his research interests to an intimate acquaintance with the administrative problems of a particular agency. This seems essential if the teacher is to reflect to his students something more than a bookish knowledge of the problems of public administrators.

In the course itself, there must continue to be attention to what may be called the philosophy of public administration. This would involve such matters as the problem of bureaucracy, the obligation of the administrator to act within the law, the reconciliation of the administrator's loyalty to his conscience with his loyalty to his agency and to his superior officer, and the democratic and authoritarian bases of relations with subordinates. The course must also give attention to the traditional interests of the

some fields of agriculture, and veterinary medicine are examples of fields that produce many public servants, but have insufficient curricular flexibility to assure inclusion of the seven core courses proposed in the text.

political scientist in the over-all structure of the executive branch of the government, in the historical development of public administration, and in executive-legislative-judicial relations.

More than in the past, though, a substantial portion of the course should be devoted to the problems of line administration and intra-agency administration. A disproportionate amount of emphasis has customarily been placed on the problems of the chief executive, on topside inter-agency relations, and on the work of major staff and control agencies, such as the Civil Service Commission, the General Accounting Office, and the Bureau of the Budget. Lest there be misunderstanding, it is not argued that these important issues should be neglected in the future. But political scientists have certainly done little in the past to open to students the problems of agency heads in relation to the internal organization and operation of their agencies, or to let them see similar problems within bureaus and divisions. Yet the bulk of the undergraduates planning to enter the public service will most of their lives have to wrestle with these intra-agency problems. Another unfortunate result of political scientists focussing their attention on the major staff and control agencies has been that these agencies, embodying as they do the hard-won legislative victories of government reformers, have been made heroes in the students' minds, to the disadvantage of the line agencies. Consequently, the students are ill-prepared to appraise either the degree to which staff and control functions can be decentralized to line agencies or the degree to which red-tape needs to be reduced in order to give operating officials the requisite authority and flexibility to achieve the ends of public policy.

The modern course in public administration must further give emphasis to the rôle of administrators in the formulation of policy. While it is true that agencies in the executive branch are charged officially with the "execution" of legislative policy, these agencies also play a significant part both in the development of policy recommendations for legislative consideration and in the determination of important public policies under the broad grants of discretion incorporated in modern legislation. Attention should be given to such problems as assuring that policy decisions get decided at the proper administrative levels, facilitating the work of policy committees and boards through secretariat and research arrangements, drawing in the opinion and technical information of groups outside the government through advisory committees and opinion polls, organizing procedures so that affected units within the executive branch are consulted in the formation of policy, and establishing the appropriate rôle of agency lawyers in the making of policy.

Students should be made aware that administration does not consist solely of copybook principles to be applied uniformly throughout the government, but is a dynamic instrument for achievement of public

policy objectives. The administrative instrument must therefore be adapted to the ends of the particular agency with its particular subject-matter assignment. For this purpose, students might well be introduced to one or more of the many administrative histories of particular agencies now available. They will get a feeling of concreteness and reality when they study such histories as those of the Department of Agriculture, the federal relief agencies, the New York Port Authority, and the war agencies.

Students should also obtain an awareness of the realistic factors that affect the life of administrative agencies. This means consideration of the rôle of personal ambition of officials, the importance to officials of symbols of status, the influence of interest groups, the ways in which subordinate units can resist overhead control and coördination, the need for adapting an agency's organization structure to the stage of the agency's life, the importance of the personal characteristics of key administrators, and administrative accommodation to the fluctuations in relative importance of agency functions.

Much stress must be placed also on the fact that administration is group activity. The student must be prepared in advance for the frustrations involved, the likelihood that many of his proposals will be rejected by superiors, the need for adapting his organization's policies and activities to those of the whole agency and to those of other units in the agency, the need for teamwork on specific projects, and the need for meeting deadlines even at the sacrifice of quality of work.

The complaints about the young men and women who have come into the public service from undergraduate training programs emphasize that the new recruits are untrained in group activity and are excessively inclined to be swivel-chair philosophers and critics producing lengthy memoranda instead of concentrating on their assigned portions of specific projects. It may be that we who teach public administration have been passing on far too much of the academic man's tradition of individual freedom and self-direction, his disposition to theoretical speculation about the great problems of society, his perfectionism on quality of research, and his difficulty in arriving at clear-cut conclusions and recommendations without elaborate qualifying remarks. None of these are qualities in which public administrators should be wholly lacking. But public administration is geared to action, and is based upon group activity and division of labor. It cannot afford to have its practitioners so imbued with academic ideals of performance that they are incapable of serving effectively in the non-academic setting of day-to-day government.

The course in public administration should give attention to the problems and techniques of administrative management. Here especially the emphasis should be on the problems of operating officials several steps

down the line from agency heads—the level often spoken of as "middle management." Attention would be given to such aspects of the practice of administration as the art of leadership and supervision of subordinates; the use of staff meetings; the development of effective lines of communication with superiors, subordinates, and coördinates through administrative orders, progress reporting arrangements, and informal contacts; the documentation of proposals and of decisions arrived at; the skills involved in presiding over, or representing one's agency at, meetings of representatives of several units, agencies, or even governments; the tools for analyzing administrative operations to bring about more effective performance.

The spirit of the teaching in the public administration course can be described only by the overworked word, "realism." We shall not advance far if we present to the students mere abstractions and general principles based on a vision of an administrative utopia staffed with carbon copies of an assumed "administrative man" comparable to the economist's "economic man." Too many products of this kind of teaching have experienced a shocking disillusionment when placed in an actual administrative environment. On the other hand, political scientists cannot in honesty instill in their students a cynicism that denies the possibility of approaching sound administrative practice. Instead, a realistic approach will emphasize that administrative posts are filled by human beings who vary not only in their skills, but in the intensity of their drives for recognition, in imaginativeness and initiative, in self-discipline, in loyalty to superiors and employing agency, and in maturity of judgment. Much of the fascination of administration is imparted by the very variety of types of persons that must somehow be brought to work together toward common objectives. The realistic approach will emphasize also that the task of the science of public administration is not to fix immutable principles for universal application or to deny the large share that the art of administration plays in achieving results. Its task is rather to isolate the factors that should be considered in arriving at administrative organization and practices, and to pin down recurrent patterns of cause and effect that will increase predictability in the field of public administration. If its task is thus conceived, it will be recognized that choice of a best course will vary with the circumstances peculiar to a given administrative situation and with the relative weight of the relevant factors.[7]

[7] One member of the Committee dissents from several passages in this and other paragraphs that discount "general principles" of public administration. The writer recognizes that any purported science must point toward the formulation of propositions having wide applicability. He simply feels that political scientists have too glibly formulated "general principles" and that students trained to slavish following of such principles make poor administrators.

Methodology in the teaching of public administration is a difficult problem. The major task is to compensate for the undergraduate student's lack of acquaintance with the administrative environment. This cannot be done by a textbook. Among the possible remedies are: frequent referring by the teacher to his own administrative experiences; arranging for the class or for individual students to visit selected administrative agencies; bringing in public administrators to report to the class on typical administrative problems, assigning readings in biographies of administrators, administrative histories of particular administrative agencies, and case studies; use of student organizations and university administration as examples; and posing of hypothetical administrative problems to students. The more promising students might be encouraged to obtain summer employment in an administrative agency between their junior and senior years, though formal internships at the undergraduate level are probably not feasible.

Beyond the introductory course in public administration lies the problem of what other courses in administration the political science department should offer at the undergraduate level. The problem is posed most acutely if the introductory public administration course is only one quarter or one semester in length, involving only fifty to seventy fifty-minute class periods. Two alternative solutions are open. One is to increase the length of the introductory course to two quarters or two semesters, and have no other undergraduate course confined exclusively to public administration. The other is to retain the brief survey course and offer several specialized courses in such subjects as public personnel administration, public financial administration, administrative organization and management, and administrative law, permitting the students to elect whichever special fields they prefer. While much will depend upon the philosophy of the particular political science department, the writer would prefer to see the basic course extended to provide a thorough grounding in public administration as a whole, while reserving the specialized courses for the graduate school. This in turn would free the undergraduate student's schedule from a requirement that he accumulate several specialized public administration courses. As a result, he could devote attention to a wider range of social science courses—such as federal, state, and local government, constitutional law, public policy, public finance, political parties and public opinion, political theory, labor relations, money and banking, agricultural economics, recent American history, logic, and ethics. The list is far from complete, but is suggestive of the range of courses that the future public administrator might find of value.

In sum, undergraduate training for public administration requires (a) recognition of the university's obligation to facilitate the movement of able graduates into the public service and to guide students into the

courses that will best equip them for that service; (b) acceptance by the political science department of a major responsibility for stimulating the university to a recognition of this obligation; (c) provision of a core curriculum, probably of as few as seven courses, which can be followed by students majoring in almost any department or school of the university, and which will provide an orientation in the social sciences, furnish knowledge of administrative tools, and afford a basic understanding of administrative problems for students planning to become subject-matter specialists, administrative specialists, or administrative generalists in the public service; (d) careful fashioning of the introductory course in public administration so that it shall give students a realistic appreciation of the problems encountered by administrators and an awareness of the experience of administrators who have sought solutions to those problems; and (e) emphasis upon guiding potential administrative specialists and administrative generalists into those advanced undergraduate social science courses which will give them a broad foundation for their later in-service training or graduate training and for their future advancement to positions of administrative responsibility.

IV. THE USE OF VISUAL AIDS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE TEACHING

JOHN D. MILLETT
Columbia University

Like his colleagues generally in the social sciences, the political scientist has prided himself upon the subject-matter content of his teaching. His responsibility has been to enlarge the understanding of the dynamic process by which men govern and are governed. Teaching and research have been coördinate elements of that responsibility. Constantly seeking to find better techniques for observation and measurement of political phenomena, ever trying to define more exactly the field of interest and knowledge, the political scientist has always focused attention upon the subject-matter of his specialization. He has had little time to devote to the problems of teaching methodology.

The very fact that higher education has been selective is another possible explanation for our seeming indifference to improvements in teacher-student communication. From necessity, teachers' colleges and the educational profession have given considerable attention to teaching techniques. Primary and secondary schools are intended for mass education. If they fulfill their purpose, they reach virtually all of the population from six to sixteen years of age. The college teacher has had no such mass obligation. Traditionally, only some ten per cent of our high school population continue with higher education, and they are usually divided among the vari-

ous fields of learning represented in colleges and universities. Selectivity and a limited audience have encouraged the college instructor to concentrate upon subject-matter and to ignore methodology.

Political scientists certainly have no reason to offer any apologies for their primary interest. Their concentration upon subject-matter should continue. At the same time, there are a number of reasons which make it appropriate, particularly now, to ask whether that concentration may not be unduly narrow. Perhaps our greatest fault has been a failure to evaluate the results achieved by our teaching efforts. Every day we assume satisfactory communication between instructor and student. If the examination results are disappointing, we gratify our ego with the assurance that the fault lies entirely with the student. We have been only vaguely aware that there is a psychology of knowledge, that there is more to teaching than carefully prepared lecture notes. We have long realized that some teachers are better than others, and we have usually ascribed the explanation to personality factors. But to ignore the psychological factors in teaching today is to indict ourselves for a failure to keep informed about the subject-matter of a specialized field of knowledge closely allied to our own.

In the second place, we hear much speculation about the effect of the influx of veterans into our educational institutions. On the one hand, we encounter dire forebodings, and on the other optimistic predictions. In the long run, that influence may be less far-reaching than some fear and others anticipate. But there is one thing all teachers should bear in mind: our armed forces were a great educational organization in themselves. For combat troops especially, many more hours were spent in learning than in actual fighting. And necessarily our armed forces had to adopt the best available means of mass communication. Teaching techniques were a major concern to the Army and Navy. Undoubtedly some of that emphasis has been carried over into the veteran's conscious and subconscious judgment. It cannot fail to affect his criticism of college teaching.

The latest prevailing consensus about teaching methods is a subject which deserves our careful attention. Many of us today are seeking more enlightenment on the whole subject of the communication of knowledge. We need further assistance from the psychologist and the educator. To be sure, we have not been totally unaware of the educational principle of learning through doing. Some of our colleges have broken up the academic year in order to permit their students to gain practical experience in their chosen fields. Others have adopted the practice exemplified by the traditional high school trip to Washington during spring vacation. Columbia College, for example, as a part of its course in contemporary civilization, has long made arrangements for its freshman students to visit various points of interest in New York City where they might observe features of

urban living. Some of our universities have made their local environment into a working laboratory. All of these practices have had their effect in giving the student a visual as well as an audial impression of the complexities of modern society.

Here, attention will be concentrated upon two aspects of visual communication, because they are familiar to members of the armed forces and because they have not been much used by political scientists. In general, visual aids mean either charts and similar graphic materials or motion picture films and film strips. These were not the only visual aids employed by the Army and Navy. But graphic aids and films played a major part in the training techniques of the armed forces and are readily adaptable to our own teaching problems.

Graphic Aids. The most common type of graphic aid is the chart. But we might include maps in the category. Certainly all teachers of political science are aware of the importance of maps. Unfortunately, we have not ordinarily made as much use of them as we might. Indeed, it would be helpful if we had some standard series of maps especially designed to illustrate the political geography of the United States and of the world. The Atlas prepared for the Army Specialized Training Program is a useful prototype.

Charts present facts, situations, or objects for making comparisons or for showing trends and developments. At least two types of charts are already familiar to political scientists—the organization chart and the statistical chart. Statisticians in particular have gone a long way in devising various forms of graphic presentation. But the emphasis has been entirely upon the presentation of statistical information in reports for administrative use. Both corporations and government agencies have expanded statistical reporting in recent years. Little if any attention has been given to the use of statistical charts for instructional purposes.

There is a real need for statistical charts which could be used in the classroom. Statistical data of various kinds must be used in teaching political science. The instructor is almost constantly referring to population and other essential data. Yet we ignore the importance of graphic presentation. If charts are important for administrative use in acquainting officials with essential aspects of their own work, why are they not equally valuable in presenting data to students who may have even less interest in acquiring or retaining the information?

No instructor in public administration is unaware of the severe limitations of the organization chart. It has often been pointed out that such a chart tends to show only formal relationships and not to reveal the actual dynamics of organization and administration. Everyday relationships are far more numerous and important than the official channels illustrated in the customary chart. Moreover, in the artist's desire for symmetry, the

usual organization chart gives no indication of relative importance or size of the various parts of an agency. Indeed, organizational essentials may be modified or even warped to achieve a "good looking" chart.

But with all these and other limitations, the organization chart continues to be an indispensable tool. No amount of cataloguing of administrative elements can ever displace an organization chart as a means of communicating essential information. This very fact demonstrates the importance of a visual image in supplementing oral presentation. We do not need fewer organization charts; we need more experimentation in their design and use. The War Production Board made some notable experiments of this kind during the war. One of the most interesting recent efforts at organization charting was the Navy Department publication in 1945 presenting "The Navy Plan for National Security." It contrasted the Navy's proposals with the so-called Army plan. This was graphic presentation with a definite purpose, and if the information conveyed was not only partisan but even misleading, the device was none the less an effective one.

Statistical charts and organizational charts, however, are not the only kind of chart material which can be used for instructional purposes. Pictorial charts are even more useful. These represent the essentials of particular information in simplified picture form. Some of the publications of the Public Affairs Committee have employed the pictorial chart to good advantage. We are all familiar with the current vogue for pictorial statistics. But the pictorial symbols used in chart presentation can be used for other purposes. Drawings may represent relationships, developments, changing circumstances, and qualitative factors in addition to simple quantitative comparisons.

Charts of all kinds were extensively used in our armed forces. Ample facilities for their preparation were readily available, so that no instructor had to rely upon the lecture method alone. Sometimes the life or death of a great many people depended upon the understanding created. For this reason, the chart was used again and again as a means of imparting emphasis and of obtaining the required comprehension of the subject.

Some administrators today are resorting extensively to charts in presenting information to Congressional committees. One outstanding example was the review of the housing situation and the recommendation of a ten-year housing program which John B. Blandford presented to the subcommittee on housing and urban redevelopment of the Senate special committee on postwar economic policy and planning in January, 1945. Many graphic materials in the reports of the National Resources Planning Board and its predecessor agencies are readily adaptable to classroom instruction.

The War Department used graphic methods extensively in analyzing procedures. The number of copies of an individual form and their flow in a particular operation were pictured as one means of exploring possible combination and elimination. The same graphic methods were then employed in presenting the new procedures for the guidance of administrative personnel. The work simplification program likewise made extensive use of graphic methods. These were vital techniques for improving administrative activities. They can, in turn, be used in the classroom for students of public administration.

There are certain definite limitations in the use of charts which we should bear in mind. To be effective, charts must be simple. Many people presenting charts for the first time try to crowd too much information on a single chart. Such a tendency is likely to create visual confusion. Aware as we are of the ramifications of our subject-matter, we are likely to find the need for simplification a severe handicap. Yet that limitation must be observed if charts are to be useful. Another common fault has been to prepare charts which are too small and which cannot be readily seen from the rear of a lecture room. Here again no chart at all is preferable to charts which cannot be seen and readily comprehended.

Some care should be observed also in the manner in which charts are presented. Army instructors were always warned to avoid any distracting influences during a lecture. If avoidable, charts should not be displayed around a room, since the gaze of the hearers may wander from chart to chart while the lecture progresses. Ideal arrangements make it possible to display a single chart at a time and to cover up all charts when they are not immediately relevant to the discussion.

The most severe limitation which the instructor faces in employing charts is the matter of facilities for preparation. In the past, college budgets have simply not provided funds for draftsmen or drafting materials. The eager instructor who would like to make use of graphic materials finds himself stymied. Unless he has technical assistance, his ideas may remain uncommunicable. It seems unlikely that many universities in the near future will be eager to spend much money in organizing central drafting facilities. The individual instructor may occasionally be able to persuade the school of engineers or architects to help him out. And some ingenious or persistent instructors may prepare their own charts, rough and imperfect though they may be.

There is no place at present where the political science teacher can go to obtain prepared charts. The Graphics Institute, 5 East 44th Street, New York 17, N. Y., has issued a catalogue of 260 pictorial charts; but these are for use in text-books and other publications rather than in the classroom.

The American Political Science Association might well experiment with

the preparation of a few basic charts for use in beginning courses on American government. Such charts would surely introduce no more standardization in instruction than is already provided by various text-books. Some organized effort offers more promise for the development of graphic aids than sporadic individual attempts.

The film strip perhaps offers the best means for bringing charts of the desired size into the classroom. Charts reproduced on 35 mm. film can be projected in the classroom, one at a time, with ready shift from one to another. Room darkness is the principal drawback. But film strips might well be prepared with a minimum of expense for the use of political scientists.

Films. For years, the motion picture film has been much talked about as an educational medium. The power of the film to instruct is unquestioned. There is probably no medium of communication available today with greater emotional and even intellectual impact than the sound motion picture. It combines uniquely the visual and the audial impression upon our sensory faculties.

There is already a considerable history of the use of films in our primary and secondary schools. And government agencies have used the film for informational purposes. Thus far, however, our legislatures have not looked with approval upon these latter efforts. The fear of government propaganda is so deep-seated that the film in the hands of administrative agencies is an immediate object of suspicion. None of us has forgotten the furor created by "The Plow That Broke the Plains," released before the 1936 presidential election. During the war, a number of government films were shown in motion picture houses as a part of the program of morale building on the home front. Now that an uneasy peace has settled upon us, the government film program has been greatly curtailed. We have never had in this country the kind of public film production which the British government has undertaken in the past fifteen years.

The Hollywood film studios have done very little to contribute to the educational usefulness of the film medium. The monthly release of "The March of Time" has provided some usable film records. More recently, a rival series entitled "This is America" likewise has produced some fairly objective treatment of important current subjects. Both are commercial enterprises, and the films are not generally available for educational institutions.

Several large corporations have made films, through small commercial producers, which depict important phases of their own work. These are "propaganda" or "good will" films, and can usually be obtained for showing without cost or at only nominal rentals. The instructor at best must spend long hours studying film catalogues, and even in viewing films, before he can find a few suitable for use in the classroom.

Some of our government agencies have employed the film for training purposes. Perhaps the outstanding example before the war was the use of the film for training the census-takers in the 1940 census. This was an excellent illustration of how films could be employed to reach a large number of persons in a short time with the minimum information necessary for the performance of their tasks. The Committee on Public Administration of the Social Science Research Council has published a report on the use of training films, together with a catalogue of available films.[1]

There are also today a few small producers of so-called "educational films." One of these is the Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, Inc., which makes films on a wide variety of subjects. Recently it released two films entitled "Democracy" and "Despotism," both of which might well be used in government courses. EBFI has also made a film on "Distributing America's Goods," sponsored by the Twentieth Century Fund, and has produced another one on housing, sponsored by the Commonwealth Fund. Most educational films are intended for primary or secondary schools, or for the general audience. Few, if any, have been made with a college classroom in mind.

Finally, some of our universities have themselves been experimenting with film production. The State University of Iowa recently made a film about its own work, to be used primarily in extension courses. It turned out to be a very helpful public relations document for showing to the state legislature.

Film production, of course, is only part of the business of using films. Equally important is film distribution. Film libraries and other film depositories have grown up on a haphazard basis. Some university libraries have accumulated outstanding collections, but there is ordinarily no systematic arrangement for serving the needs of the entire adjacent area. Thus duplicating facilities have grown up while many commercial films can be obtained only through commercial channels. Most parts of the country are now served by one or more film collections, but much can still be done to rationalize film distribution. In January, 1947, the Library of Congress issued a partial list of film libraries in the United States.

Fortunately, there are some central sources of film information. The H. W. Wilson Company, of New York City, publishes a monthly film catalogue, together with a cumulative annual edition. Part II of this *Educational Film Guide* contains a selected list of outstanding films and a description of the level at which the material can be used. *Educational Screen*, published monthly by Educational Screen, Inc., 64 East Lake Street, Chicago, contains evaluations of new films by a teacher committee;

[1] John E. Devine, *Films as an Aid in Training Public Employees* (1937).

but the members are educators concerned primarily with public school use of films.

War Film Production. The big development in the use of films for training purposes came in the War and Navy Departments during World War II. The importance of the film medium was appreciated from the outset, and millions of dollars were made available for training films. The entire resources of the motion picture industry were readily provided both agencies. In addition, the Army established its own production studio, manned with personnel largely recruited or drafted from the motion picture industry. The outstanding talent of the country was utilized. The result was a tremendous motion picture production program. In a single year, the War Department produced more than a thousand films, with a footage of more than two million feet. If anything, the film medium was used for many subjects which were too technical for effective film presentation. Before the war ended, both departments had come to realize that there were definite limitations to the use of films for instructional purposes, and steps were taken to curtail the output.

Most instructional films produced by the Army and Navy dealt with specialized subjects—the use and care of the M1 rifle, the operation of the amphibious truck, or the detection and removal of land and sea mines. But the film could also be used for more general purposes, to instruct in the customs and traditions of military service, the system of military justice, and the ravages of venereal disease. Probably the films which attracted the most attention were the "Why We Fight" series produced by Colonel Frank Capra. These films were prepared for the orientation program in order to give some information about the background of the war as well as its actual development. These films should have a continuing historical value.

Other films were made for a definite informational purpose. One film was produced and released inside the Army relating to the Negro soldier. Other films were made to give information about our allies. One film originally made to show troops as they were discharged from the Army was of outstanding quality. Entitled "Don't be a Sucker," this film was a warning to the veteran about the divisive forces in American society which might attempt to undo all that had been made possible by our victory. This film was released for commercial showing in 1946. It is one which ought to be very useful to teachers of political science.

The Army and Navy also used extensive footage in recording combat and service operations overseas. Some of this film was produced for instructional purposes and shown to military personnel. Other footage was released to the newsreels, or made into such special features as "The Battle of Midway," "The Real Glory," and "On to Tokyo." Some special productions were shown in war plants. A few films were made for training

civilian employees. The film "Two Down and One To Go" was produced and shown first to the Army and then to the public as a means of explaining the redeployment problem after the defeat of Germany and the system for discharging military personnel from the Army. In 1947, the War Department decided to make most of these films available without cost in both 16 mm. and 35 mm. size. Upon payment of transportation charges, films may be obtained from the signal officer of the six Army Areas in the United States.

The Office of War Information obtained the assistance of the motion picture industry in producing and releasing a number of films for domestic and overseas consumption during the war. The films made for overseas release are of particular value to political scientists; "The Valley of the Tennessee" is an example. The Office of Price Administration also resorted to the film medium in explaining the evils of the black market and the importance of price control.

At the conclusion of World War II, there was a great deal of interest in the disposition of war training and information films. Three things have delayed action. In the first place, much film and accompanying sound tracks were made available to the War and Navy Departments by commercial studios without copyright limitations. It has been a knotty legal problem whether such film copyrighted privately could be disposed of by the government to film depositories. In the second place, the War and Navy Departments have been slow to declare films surplus. There has been some uncertainty about their future training load; and then some commercial interests have brought pressure to bear, since they fear possible competition which would lessen the demand for new educational films. Finally, there has been some confusion and discord within the government about who should be responsible for the custody and disposition of government film. This seems, however, to have been resolved in favor of the Library of Congress.

The Library of Congress Film Program. In July, 1945, the Library of Congress set up a motion picture division to accumulate prints of all government films. In addition, this office was intended to become a clearing house for information about government films. The first hurdle was a budgetary one; appropriations on a fairly adequate scale were finally obtained for the fiscal year 1947. Then in 1946 the Library, on recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, was given responsibility for distributing government films.

In January, 1947, the Motion Picture Division announced its plans. Surplus government films will be lent to various film depositories throughout the country; for other government film, the Division has been making arrangement for film libraries to obtain prints from laboratories at reasonable cost. The Library of Congress will not distribute films directly to

individuals. In 1947, the Division also began publication of lists of films recently released by government agencies, together with instructions for obtaining them.

John G. Bradley, director of the Motion Picture Division, described the Library of Congress film program at a round table during the Cleveland meeting of the American Political Science Association, and it was recommended by those present that the Association designate persons to review government films as released and report on them in the pages of this REVIEW.

The Use of Films for Instructional Purposes. The instructor who would use films must overcome numerous obstacles. Granted that he learns about available films appropriate to his needs, he must still have the funds available for film rental and have access to screening facilities. Today most films are available only on a rental basis. Funds to defray rental and transportation costs need to be included in department instruction budgets.

While projection equipment is much less costly now than twenty years ago, it still is a sizeable item. Most universities today own 16 mm. and 35 mm. sound projection equipment, and usually have one or two projection rooms. Advocates of educational film-use generally favor motion picture projection in the classroom itself. This emphasizes that the film is an instructional medium. It avoids movement of students back and forth between classroom and projection room. Also, to be most effectively employed, a film should be discussed immediately after it is shown. This means that projection facilities must be available in the classroom. As new classroom buildings are constructed, this need should be kept in mind.

In the long run, successful use of films in political science will depend upon the production of films specifically to meet our needs; and this is an undertaking which the American Political Science Association might well sponsor. The subject of Congress would seem to be "a natural" for film purposes.

Conclusion. We need to understand that the motion picture medium has its own definite techniques. Wartime film-making revealed a constant difference of opinion between the specialist in film techniques and the specialist in the subject-matter treated. When the first dominates film production, accuracy is often sacrificed for presentation effectiveness. When the latter dominates, the resulting film generally makes only partial utilization of the full potentialities of the film medium. There is little advantage in employing a film simply to photograph a classroom lecture. The subject treated must be vivid, real, and appealing. Since the political scientist is above all else interested in subject content, he must insist upon the highest possible degree of accuracy within the limits of our present available knowledge. At the same time, he must appreciate that

the motion picture has its own technique and its own power. Not to obtain the full benefit of the medium is to sacrifice film effectiveness.

I would not suggest that the political scientist lessen his interest in subject-matter. Our first obligation must be that of enlarging the boundaries of our special field of concentration. That effort will in turn be reflected in our teaching, and training aids must not become a crutch for the support of the indifferent or ill-prepared instructor. The first obligation of the teacher is to know his subject, and the second is to prepare adequately for presenting it to his students. But there seems little reason today why in our concern for preparation we should ignore or belittle commonly accepted media for effective presentation. Teachers of political science generally can well afford to make more use of charts and other graphic materials. The motion picture film can be brought into the classroom. Neither displaces the teacher. Both are only what their name suggests—visual *aids*.

Many teachers, as individuals, are already exploring the use of such training aids. Undoubtedly they will continue their efforts, regardless of the assistance or the indifference which they encounter from their colleagues. But the eventual successful exploitation of training aids for political scientists depends upon group action. The political science profession as a whole should take cognizance of this problem and actively explore every means by which all of us might become more effective teachers.

V. THE TEACHER OF GOVERNMENT

ETHAN P. ALLEN
University of Kansas

These are days when the individual who would devote himself to the study and teaching of political science stands upon the threshold of new and exciting adventures and a lot of very hard work. His mind and his enthusiasms must be keyed to the great possibilities for constructive advancement to be found in a period of social transition. There are those among us who insist with great cogency that we should turn back to the achievements of the "wisdom of the ages" and find there the insight and answers to our current perplexities. Incisive as were the achievements of the great minds of the past, as right as were their prescriptions for their own times and difficulties, few among us would defend the proposition that *all* wisdom and *all* understanding reside solely with those who have given us our foundations. Much remains to be uncovered amidst the back-wash of a world-wide revolution. The teacher of political science must balance the wisdom of the past against present possibilities for the greater understanding and clearer insight into political institutions to be found in the quickening imagination of the contemporary scene. We must

cut new paths. We must produce our Einstein. Perhaps we have, and are now ready for our own Manhattan Project. But to do this we must face squarely and honestly at least six major problems in this postwar period: (1) graduate preparation; (2) community leadership; (3) teaching load; (4) research; (5) salaries; and (6) academic freedom.

Diverse are the interests of those who are now preparing to enter the profession at the college or university level. It is increasingly obvious that specialization at the graduate level must recognize the basic and fundamental differences between preparation for positions in public service, research positions, and university teaching. Indeed, in some respects training for "group" research is fundamentally different from that needed for "individual" research. There may be a basic divergence of preparatory needs between those who will teach "general college" courses and those who will teach "upper class" or "graduate" or "specialized" courses. In spite of these obvious and necessary distinctions, a common core of minimum results should be required of all.[1]

Not too long ago, most students entering graduate work in political science were seeking to prepare themselves for teaching the subject or for carrying on individual research in the field. During the twenties and thirties, there developed a heavy emphasis upon the doctor's degree, as such, as a minimum requirement for securing a teaching or a research position in political science. In their lighter moments (and with perhaps a touch of ironic truth), many persons have referred to the Ph.D. degree as a "trade union card," thus reflecting a skeptical and perhaps cynical attitude toward the degree's value. In all honesty, it must be stated that too much graduate training consists of satisfying requirements covering hours, grades, qualifying examinations, languages, dissertations, and final orals rather than a whole-hearted, dispassionate, and objective search for factual and ethical truth. One does not become either a great teacher or a creative research scholar by following form rather than substance—witness the great names of political science from the earliest days to the present. Graduate preparation must, then, place as its primary goal the unfettering of imagination and the development of a whole-hearted drive to discover new, and perhaps unknown, techniques applicable to the study of our political institutions. This task in itself is sufficiently great to consume the time and energy of even the best of our neophytes as well as of our wiser and more mature colleagues. Nevertheless, it is but one aspect of preparation for teaching and does not by any means complete the charge placed upon one who would place his talents at the command of truth.

The teacher of political science not only presides in the classroom (on

[1] While this problem is treated more fully elsewhere in this report, a word concerning the need for a frank recognition of this diversity of interest and for a balancing of our graduate programs to meet the need would seem in order.

his ivory-towered campus) as the high priest of truth, factually considered, but he must inevitably assume the rôle of moral and ethical judge. That he express his considered judgment as to the value of his factual material, and that he possess the moral courage essential to an impassioned defense of his convictions, if necessary, is a basic *desideratum* too often ignored. In a very real sense, the teacher of political science must assume the position of a protagonist for the democratic philosophy without which his search for truth would be virtually impossible. Somewhere in his preparation, this sharpening of the moral conscience and this quickening of the sense of man's innate humanity must be secured. Perhaps this is the point where the wisdom of ages and a new and vigorous interpretation of political philosophy meet their greatest test and offer their greatest challenge.[2]

The call on the time and energy of a teacher of political science is far from exhausted with this sound, objective, and continuous training in factual subject-matter together with the development of a critical social conscience. Not only must the political scientist be a scholar; he must be a socially and politically responsible man as well. He is responsible both as a teacher *and as a citizen* for active participation in the political life not only within academic halls but in his community—the source from which he draws his sustenance and to which he owes his allegiance. He must therefore take an active and vital part in the practical political life of mankind. He must possess the moral courage necessary to go into the "market place" of the world and deal effectively with the day-by-day requirements of practical political activity. This, of course, is a truism applicable to all university teachers. But there are obvious reasons why the political scientist must be particularly conscious of this responsibility if he is to be a vital force in our democracy.

He should be free, as far as university administrations are concerned, to serve on city commissions, in city councils, in state legislatures, in state administrative posts, and in various federal capacities, without losing either his academic tenure or his academic freedom. It would therefore seem wise to urge that the "leave of absence" and the practice of "sabbatical leave" be more frequently and generously utilized by university administrations in order that the talent possessed by their social scientists may be placed at the disposal of our political institutions, to the end that better government may be achieved. Too often the teacher of political science withholds himself from this desirable activity for fear of administrative displeasure or because of the necessity of resigning his academic position. In this respect, the teacher of political science stands in a quite

[2] What is here said applies with equal force to that continuous preparation essential to successful individual growth by those who have secured their doctorates and are teaching or conducting research or practicing political science. Indeed, it is so intended.

different category from other professional men. The lawyer may reënter the practice of law after a period of public service without too many misgivings regarding his financial future. So may the engineer, the business man, or the farmer. The political scientist, however, finds himself, largely because of the nature of his subject-matter and his professional training, in a much more dependent financial position than persons in the groups mentioned. His academic value can best be enhanced through a more generous "leave of absence" and "sabbatical leave" policy.

This suggestion is urged not solely in the interest of the teacher, but also and particularly in that of the returns which such experience brings to the classroom and to the community at large. One who is able to participate actively and immediately in the formation and execution of public policy through governmental institutions and processes returns to the campus a wiser and more realistic student and teacher of political science. This increase in stature reflects itself in better teaching, and thus serves the community by returning to it a wiser and more mature body of young citizens. Practical governmental and political experience not only results in an enrichment of the curricular offerings, but also opens unexplored avenues of research in political science.

In spite of the wartime experience of administrations and professors in granting and accepting leaves of absence, this point needs emphasis for the long-run pull. Necessity sometimes creates virtues. While universities were generous in loaning staff in all fields, budgetary considerations were not lacking in the decisions. Present enrollments and long-range prospects of teaching loads point up, in sharp fashion, the problems involved in continuing a sound and liberal policy of granting leaves of absence. Shortages of teaching personnel will not make the solution an easy one. But the policy is essential to the continuous growth required of a vital department of political science.

Not only must the teacher of political science preside with impassioned impartiality over his classes and renew his wisdom in the fire of practical political and administrative experience, but he must also be willing, and in its best sense anxious, to assume a position of leadership in the manifold formal and informal opportunities available in any community. His moral and factual integrity must be so certain that his fellow-citizens will automatically turn to him for aid in clarifying political problems and for advice on charting possible courses of action. Such a charge places grave responsibilities upon, as well as opens vast opportunities to, the political scientist. He must be able to speak to the Wednesday Afternoon Ladies' Club with the same seriousness of purpose that he devotes to his duties as chairman of the community planning commission. Both must be as important to him *and to his academic superiors* as is his effectiveness in the classroom or as is the cogency of his research publications. The time and energy devoted to such activities must not be considered, either by him-

self or by the administration, as extra-curricular activities expected of the political scientist but not to be considered as a part of a man's load. Such activities are as significant to the institution as are the hours spent by the physical and natural scientists in their expensive laboratories. The laboratory of the political scientist stands ready at hand, and its use should be encouraged, not penalized or "frowned upon," by university administrators.

In too many institutions, the academic load is measured by the number of clock hours spent in the classroom or by that device known as the "pupil hour" load. Either device, taken by itself as sole determinant of the load, is misleading and can become a vicious instrument of frustration. I have attempted to indicate the enormous and legitimate demand upon the time, energy, and talents of the teacher of political science. All of these activities should be considered as the proper load of a department of political science. Very few individuals can be called upon to carry the full load of social and institutional responsibilities outlined. Perhaps no single individual should be called upon to carry all of these desirable activities. A department of political science, however, should be expected to encompass such a program.

Promotion policies should take into consideration the traditional factors of teaching effectiveness, research programs, and finished publications. They should also consider active leadership in community affairs and practical political wisdom and performance. If astuteness in campus politics is to find reward in budgetary considerations, why should not political astuteness in a wider and more socially useful area find at least equal rewards?

Obviously, promotional policies should not require of a single individual that he be a modern Plato in order to achieve the dizzy heights of a full professorship. Each person's advancement should depend solely upon his contribution to the total program demanded of political science. Each activity must be recognized for its own and its equal value. The creative research scholar should be advanced in recognition of his contribution (research), even though his teaching effectiveness admittedly may be less than that of a colleague, and *vice versa*. Budgetary officers and university administrators must recognize these factors as of equal significance. The practice, all too prevalent, of conceding a man's contributions to his state in terms of leadership, but deploring his lack of research publications (thus rationalizing their inability to provide financial or professorial advancement) must not be allowed to continue. Good men rapidly become ineffective under such a system of paternalistic double-talk.

The leaven of research is an essential ingredient in producing a strong and vigorous department of political science. There is something about the inquisitive research mind which stimulates graduate students and extends its influence, in subtle ways, throughout the department. Re-

search—the extension of man's knowledge of his political life—not the compilation of bibliographical listings of "one's publications," is the element needed. Encouragement in terms of lighter teaching loads, full and adequate library and laboratory facilities, and genuine assistance must be provided that rare colleague who really wants to contribute and can contribute to the "sum total of human knowledge." These contributions must be made available not only to fellow-specialists but to the intelligent layman as well. Knowledge for its own sake can be a very sterile thing. But knowledge put to work can be a very exciting adventure, both for the research scholar and for his fellow-citizens. Universities would do well, therefore, to continue and expand their support of university presses, bureaus of government research, bureaus of public administration, and the like. For through such channels, new knowledge is put to work.

Even at the risk of being repetitious, it must be emphasized that we are here dealing with research and the application of its products to specific social situations and political institutions and practices. We are not dealing with text-book writing or the all too prevalent practice of producing "pot boilers" so as to be able to present the dean with a list of publications. A man's value to a university should depend upon his contributions to the total educational process and not solely upon his editorial connections.

A well-balanced department can carry the load required of it and can provide the *esprit de corps* essential to effective leadership only if the institutional policies clearly recognize the group nature of the total job and provide for advancement on the contribution of each individual to the total job. The fetishes of publication lists, enrollment figures, or faculty or student gossip must give way to more realistic standards. Many and diverse are the proper functions of a vigorous department of political science. They must be paid for.

The discovery of a genuine and lasting pleasure in those intangible satisfactions known only to the true academician has long been properly praised as the correct attitude toward one's salary. The compensating factors of an academic life have drawn, and still draw, many to the scholarly pursuit of truth. Even our rationalizations are pleasant! But rationalization may lead to a dangerous complacency. Too often these intangible satisfactions have dominated budgetary considerations. It is, in some circles, fashionable today to urge salary increases on the basis of increased costs of living. Such a position, however, has its disadvantages. The sword cuts in both directions. Salary adjustments now made on a cost of living basis do not solve the basic problem of inadequate salaries.

Generally speaking, and with very few exceptions, university salaries today are not sufficiently appealing to attract and hold good talent in competition with either business or government. True, our economy may

be deflated. True, the supply of prospective teachers and research scholars may catch up with the existing demand. True, professional skills and talents may be looked upon as economic goods offered in a free market, to be bargained for by competing institutions. But such a situation does not draw the best minds toward teaching and research. This seems true simply because universities and colleges cannot match the funds available to business and government. But the existing gap between the academic salary schedule and the salaries available elsewhere can be more nearly closed. It *must* be more nearly closed. Unless general, generous, and permanent salary increases become a vital and significant part of permanent policies in our institutions of higher learning, future academic growth is seriously threatened. Too many men have already been lost to the academic world to allow the writing on the wall to go unheeded. The profession must be made attractive enough, in comparison with salaries paid by business and government, to allow the intangible wages of a scholar to tip the balance. Enough should be asked to secure genuinely interested individuals. But certainly too much has been asked too often in the past. Services rendered should be paid for no less in the case of university professors than in the case of any other profession. This is not the place to labor the point. Professor Slichter has made the point crystal clear in the winter number of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors.

This report has emphasized freedom for the political scientist: freedom in preparation to meet the needs of an increasingly varied profession; freedom to serve in responsible public positions; freedom to become leaders in the community; and freedom to meet salary competition on the part of non-academic institutions. Lastly, a word on academic freedom itself.

Without attempting to develop here a formal definition of academic freedom, it seems obvious that such freedom entails risks, both for the individual and for the institution. But does not all freedom entail risk? This is true in endowed institutions where boards of trustees may be excessively zealous in desiring to protect the *status quo* against scientific scrutiny and at state-supported schools where boards of education may be too sensitive to the pressures inevitably present. Here the scholarly integrity of the soundly trained political scientist stands him in good stead. It goes almost without saying that the sense of personal and institutional responsibility must be a vital reality, not only in the thoughts, but also in the actions, of the political scientist. Such responsibility is a measure of a man's intellectual and emotional maturity.

In a sense, our responsibilities are greater in the many "off campus" activities engaged in by our profession. Here we deal, not with young and immature minds, nor with immediately ineffective (politically considered) individuals. As a vigorous community leader, the political scientist is in a

position to affect the daily lives of his neighbors, to aid in directing social pressures at work, to move his fellowmen toward greater achievements. In our laboratories, we work with materials far more explosive than those of the atomic physicist. We deal not with inert materials subject to our control, but with living factors of tremendous force and with the lives and hopes of our fellow-citizens. Indeed a sobering thought! One that can only develop a deep sense of ethical and social responsibility.

The liberty essential to intellectual growth, to effective and honest teaching, and to effective participation in the political life of the nation has its price—a price which must be paid. But the price is not security at the cost of honesty and intellectual and moral courage. University administrations must expect social truth to be at times as unpopular as have been the truths of biology in the not too distant past. Academic freedom does not mean license. Neither does it mean stultifying fear of reprisals. It applies to administrators as well as to teachers.

These remarks underscore the difficulty of the problem of granting academic freedom in a democratic society, and in tax-supported institutions in particular. Possibly the most dangerous shoals in the present social seas are those latent in all societies which can, and too often do, drown the voice of reason and truth. But democracy itself cannot survive unless responsible freedom lives not only in the classroom and for the academician, but also in the world of mundane affairs and for the layman.

Too often the fight for academic freedom has been a struggle between professor and administrator, sometimes in the open, sometimes subtle and therefore vicious. The truly great institutions of learning are those which stand, as institutions, for the free pursuit of truth. Administrators and professors are in the same boat. They work as a team or they go down together. Academic freedom is a reality only where both professors and administrators believe in it, and where a large measure of mutual trust exists.

In periods of social transition like the one in which we live, freedom indeed suffers the "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune." Having won the physical victory over the philosophy of brute and amoral force, it is now essential that we achieve the still greater victory of championing freedom as a social and political reality. The political scientist stands on the firing line; he deserves and should have the complete and wholehearted support of his administrative superiors. Should freedom languish in the hearts of men, democracy dies. With its death, the educational institution loses its essential character as a center of intellectual growth and defender of our heritage of the unfettered intellect. Either we are free men in free institutions or we fall short of the real meaning and trust of our heritage. Any other path means the subordination of truth to the end of expediency. This is the complete negation of our Hebraic-Hellenistic-Christian tradition.

NEWS AND NOTES

PERSONAL AND MISCELLANEOUS

Compiled by the Managing Editor

Committees of the American Political Science Association for the Year 1947. The members of Association committees are appointed in most cases by the President for one-year terms, continuity being secured by a due proportion of reappointments.

Committee on American Legislatures: Jack F. Isakoff (Illinois Legislative Council), *chairman;* Donald Axelrod (Temporary Commission on Coordination of State Activities, Albany, N. Y.); G. Lowell Field (Wayne University); George B. Galloway (Library of Congress); W. Brooke Graves (Library of Congress); Frederick H. Guild (Kansas Legislative Council); Arthur N. Holcombe (Harvard University); John A. Perkins (University of Michigan); Orba F. Traylor (University of Denver); Belle Zeller (Brooklyn College).

Committee on Awards (to be announced annually, first at the 1947 annual meeting): Robert D. Leigh (Social Science Research Council, Public Library Inquiry), *general chairman.* Panel for the award by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation for the best publication each year in the field of *Government and Democracy:* Francis W. Coker (Yale University), *chairman;* Paul H. Appleby (Syracuse University); Pendleton Herring (Carnegie Corporation of New York); Carl B. Swisher (Johns Hopkins University); David B. Truman (Harvard University). Panel for the award by the Willkie Memorial Building for the best publication each year in the field of *International Relations:* Payson S. Wild, Jr. (Harvard University), *chairman;* Ralph J. Bunche (United Nations, Lake Success, N. Y.); William T. R. Fox (Yale University); George B. Noble (Department of State); George E. Taylor (University of Washington). Panel for the award by the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Association for the best publication each year in the field of *Government and Human Welfare:* Charles E. Merriam (University of Chicago), *chairman;* James L. McCamy (University of Wisconsin); Charles McKinley (Reed College); Charles C. Rohlfing (University of Pennsylvania); Sterling D. Spero (New York University).

Committee on the Directory (currently engaged in preparing for a second edition): Kenneth Colegrove (Northwestern University), *chairman;* Franklin L. Burdette (University of Maryland), *editor:* William Anderson (University of Minnesota); John E. Briggs (State University of Iowa); Robert E. Cushman (Cornell University); Arthur W. Macmahon (Colum-

bia University); Frederic A. Ogg (University of Wisconsin); Harvey Walker (Ohio State University).

Committee on Endowment: William Anderson (University of Minnesota), *chairman;* Charles A. Beard (New Milford, Conn.); Joseph P. Chamberlain (Columbia University); Kenneth Colegrove (Northwestern University); Frederick M. Davenport (National Institute of Public Affairs); Walter F. Dodd (Chicago, Ill.); John M. Gaus (University of Wisconsin); Charles G. Haines (University of California at Los Angeles); Arthur N. Holcombe (Harvard University); Isidor Loeb (Washington University); Charles E. Merriam (University of Chicago); William B. Munro (California Institute of Technology); Frederic A. Ogg (University of Wisconsin); Lindsay Rogers (Columbia University).

Committee on Improvement of Teaching (this committee, among other responsibilities, picks up phases of the work of the former committees on undergraduate instruction and on social studies): Marshall E. Dimock (Northwestern University), *chairman;* Ethan P. Allen (University of Kansas); Asher N. Christensen (University of Minnesota); Harold M. Dorr (University of Michigan); James W. Fesler (University of North Carolina); Marian D. Irish (Florida State College for Women); Jack T. Johnson (State University of Iowa); John W. Manning (American University); Ruth G. Weintraub (Hunter College); Howard White (Miami University); Francis O. Wilcox (Library of Congress); Benjamin F. Wright (Harvard University).

Committee on International Cultural Relations: Pitman B. Potter (American University), *chairman;* Clarence A. Berdahl (University of Illinois); P. E. Corbett (Yale University); Clyde Eagleton (New York University); Malbone W. Graham (University of California at Los Angeles); Grayson Kirk (Columbia University); John Brown Mason (Oberlin College); Walter R. Sharp (College of the City of New York); Quincy Wright (University of Chicago).

Committee on Judicial Organization and Administration: Arthur T. Vanderbilt (New York University Law School), *chairman;* Francis R. Aumann (Ohio State University), *vice-chairman;* James Patterson Alexander (Supreme Court of Texas; National Conference of Judicial Councils); Edwin Borchard (Yale University); A. B. Butts (Fort Monroe, Va.); Henry P. Chandler (Administrative Office of the United States Courts); John Dickinson (Philadelphia, Pa.); Walter F. Dodd (Chicago, Ill.); Charles Fairman (Stanford University); Oliver P. Field (Indiana University); Laurance M. Hyde (Supreme Court of Missouri); Earl Latham (University of Minnesota); Bolitha J. Laws (United States District Court for the District of Columbia); Dayton McKean (Dartmouth

College); Rodney L. Mott (Colgate University); John J. Parker (United States Circuit Court of Appeals); C. Herman Pritchett (University of Chicago); George Rossman (Supreme Court of Oregon); Edson R. Sunderland (University of Michigan Law School); Ralph R. Temple (Harrisburg, Pa.).

Provisional Panel on the Creation of a Committee on Government and Labor-Management Relations: Phillips Bradley (University of Illinois), *chairman.*

Committee on Latin American Affairs: Russell H. Fitzgibbon (University of California at Los Angeles), *chairman;* Willard F. Barber (Department of State); Asher N. Christensen (University of Minnesota); William Ebenstein (Princeton University); William S. Stokes (University of Wisconsin); Graham H. Stuart (Stanford University); Arthur P. Whitaker (University of Pennsylvania).

Committee on a Library of Political Thought: John D. Lewis (Oberlin College), *chairman;* Francis W. Coker (Yale University); Peter Odegard (Reed College); J. Roland Pennock (Swarthmore College); C. B. Robson (University of North Carolina); René de V. Williamson (University of Tennessee); Francis G. Wilson (University of Illinois); Benjamin F. Wright (Harvard University). (A merger in this committee of the work of the former panel on European texts is under consideration.)

Committee on Local Arrangements for 1947 Annual Meeting: John W. Manning (American University), *chairman;* Ralph J. Bunche (United Nations, Lake Success, N. Y.); Franklin L. Burdette (University of Maryland); Paul M. A. Linebarger (School for Advanced International Studies); Lewis Meriam (Brookings Institution); Wilfrid Parsons, S. J. (Catholic University); Don K. Price (Public Administration Clearing House); Karl Stromsen (National Institute of Public Affairs); W. Reed West (George Washington University); Francis O. Wilcox (Library of Congress); Gerard F. Yates, S.J. (Georgetown University).

Provisional Panel on the Desirability of a Permanent Committee or Other Action Regarding the Machinery of Government: William Y. Elliott (Harvard University), *chairman.*

Committee on Nomination of Officers for 1948: Harold Zink (DePauw University), *chairman;* Charles Aikin (University of California); Denna F. Fleming (Vanderbilt University); John M. Gaus (University of Wisconsin); Alpheus T. Mason (Princeton University).

Committee on Political Parties: Elmer E. Schattschneider (Wesleyan University), *chairman;* Thomas S. Barclay (Stanford University); Clarence A. Berdahl (University of Illinois); Hugh A. Bone (Queens College);

Franklin L. Burdette (University of Maryland); Harwood L. Childs (Princeton University); Paul T. David (Department of State); Thomas C. Donnelly (University of New Mexico); Merle Fainsod (Harvard University); Bertram M. Gross (Council of Economic Advisers); V. O. Key (Johns Hopkins University); E. M. Kirkpatrick (University of Minnesota); John W. Lederle (University of Michigan); Fritz Morstein Marx (Bureau of the Budget); Peter Odegard (Reed College); Howard Penniman (Yale University); Kirk H. Porter (State University of Iowa); J. B. Shannon (University of Kentucky); T. V. Smith (University of Chicago).

Advisory Panel on Methods of Encouraging Political Participation (because of the nature of the proposal that was the immediate cause of its establishment, this pilot panel is largely confined to the New York metropolitan area and vicinity): Hugh A. Bone (Queens College), *chairman;* John E. Bebout (National Municipal League); William S. Carpenter (Princeton University); Lawrence H. Chamberlain (Columbia University); Frances P. De Lancey (Vassar College); W. Leon Godshall (Lehigh University); John J. George (Rutgers University); Madge M. McKinney (Hunter College); Howard Penniman (Yale University); Norman J. Powell (College of the City of New York); William J. Ronan (New York University); Elmer E. Schattschneider (Wesleyan University); Howard White (Miami University); Belle Zeller (Brooklyn College).

Committee on Program, 1947 Annual Meeting: Hugh L. Elsbree (Library of Congress), *chairman;* Phillips Bradley (University of Illinois); J. Alton Burdine (University of Texas); Merle Fainsod (Harvard University); Patterson H. French (Bureau of the Budget); Harold F. Gosnell (Department of State); George A. Graham (Princeton University); Halford L. Hoskins (School of Advanced International Studies); Harvey C. Mansfield (Office of Temporary Controls); Peter H. Odegard (Reed College); Merlo J. Pusey (Washington *Post*); Robert S. Rankin (Duke University); Walter E. Sandelius (University of Kansas); Frederick M. Watkins (McGill University).

Committee on the Publication of Election Statistics: W. Reed West (George Washington University), *chairman;* Thomas S. Barclay (Stanford University); Harold F. Gosnell (Department of State); James K. Pollock (University of Michigan); Alden L. Powell (Louisiana State University); Elmer E. Schattschneider (Wesleyan University); Catheryn Seckler-Hudson (American University).

Representative in Connection with Department of State Publications: Royden J. Dangerfield (University of Oklahoma).

Committee on Regional and Functional Societies: John E. Briggs (State University of Iowa), *chairman;* R. Jean Brownlee (Philadelphia, Pa.); Thomas C. Cook (University of Washington); G. Homer Durham (University of Utah); Robert J. Harris (Louisiana State University); Matthew C. Mitchell (Brown University); Joseph C. Pray (University of Oklahoma); Pitman B. Potter (American Society of International Law); Leonard D. White (American Society for Public Administration); Francis O. Wilcox (Library of Congress); Harold Zink (DePauw University).

Committee on Research: Taylor Cole (Duke University), *chairman;* William Anderson (University of Minnesota); Arnold Brecht (Graduate Faculty, New School for Social Research); J. Alton Burdine (University of Texas); Charles Fairman (Stanford University); Carl Friedrich (Harvard University); Ernest S. Griffith (Library of Congress); Charles S. Hyneman (Northwestern University); William P. Maddox (Department of State); Charles E. Merriam (University of Chicago); Dorothy Schaffter (Library of Congress); Harold W. Stoke (University of New Hampshire); Carl B. Swisher (Johns Hopkins University); Francis G. Wilson (University of Illinois).

Trust Committee: President of the Association, ex-officio, *chairman;* Secretary-Treasurer of the Association, ex officio; William Anderson (University of Minnesota); John M. Gaus (University of Wisconsin); Edwin O. Griffenhagen (Chicago, Ill.); John Day Larkin (Illinois Institute of Technology); Leonard D. White (University of Chicago).

Memorial Awards in Political Science. President Arthur W. Macmahon of the American Political Science Association has announced the creation of a new Association Committee on Awards, to be charged with supervising the competition for three awards for publications in the field of political science. The new Committee on Awards is in line with the recommendation presented by Ernest Griffith, chairman of the Association's Research Committee and approved by the Association at its forty-second annual meeting in Cleveland last December.

Robert D. Leigh, now on the staff of the Social Science Research Council, as director of its Public Library Inquiry, has been appointed general chairman of the Committee. Chairman of the panel to make the memorial award by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation for the outstanding publication of the year dealing with *government and democracy* is Professor Francis W. Coker of Yale University, New Haven, Conn. Chairman of the panel to make the memorial award by the Willkie Memorial Building for the outstanding publication of the year in the field of *international relations* is Dean Payson S. Wild, Jr., Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. Chairman of the panel to

make the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Foundation award for the outstanding publication of the year on *government and human welfare* is Professor Charles E. Merriam, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Authors wishing to submit a publication for any one of the three awards should send six copies to the chairman of the appropriate panel.

The other members of the Committee on Awards are:

Panel on Government and Democracy
Dean Paul H. Appleby, Syracuse University
Dr. Pendleton Herring, Carnegie Corporation of New York
Professor Carl B. Swisher, Johns Hopkins University
Assistant Professor David B. Truman, Harvard University

Panel on International Relations
Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, United Nations, Lake Success, N. Y.
Professor William T. R. Fox, Yale University
Dr. G. Bernard Noble, Department of State, Washington, D. C.
Professor George Taylor, University of Washington

Panel on Government and Human Welfare
Professor James L. McCamy, University of Wisconsin
Professor Charles McKinley, Reed College
Professor Charles C. Rohlfing, University of Pennsylvania
Professor Sterling Spero, New York University

The Committee has adopted the following regulations for its guidance and for the information of those who wish to have publications considered for the awards:

I. SUBMISSION OF PUBLICATIONS

1. Any author who is a citizen or resident of the United States, or his publisher, may submit a publication for consideration by the appropriate panel.
2. Any member of the Committee, or of the American Political Science Association, may submit a publication by another author for consideration by any of the panels.
3. A member may not, during the period of his committee membership, be a contestant for any of the awards.
4. Only works published during the twelve-month period preceding October 1, the closing date for entries for each year's awards, shall be eligible for consideration. For the first awards (1946–47), however, works published during the period February, 1946–September 30, 1947, will be considered. Publications shall be in the hands of the Committee not later than October 1, to be eligible for that year's awards.
5. Publications shall be submitted in the form of printed books, articles, or monographs. The Committee may make exception in the case of researches of particular merit which have appeared in some other duplicated form.
6. Six copies of each publication shall be submitted to the chairman of the panel for which it is entered in competition for an award.
7. In general, a publication shall be considered by one panel only. If in any year more than one panel favors the same publication, the general chairman and the chairmen of the two or three panels involved shall decide upon the nature of the award to be made.

II. SELECTION OF WINNING PUBLICATIONS

1. Final decision regarding the publication to be given the award in each of the three fields shall be made by the members of the Committee constituting the panel dealing with that field.
2. A majority of votes of the panel members shall determine the winning publication. If the vote in any one panel is by bare majority, i.e., 3 to 2, the general chairman of the Committee shall cast his vote with the panel. If the combined vote results finally in a tie, no award shall be made.
3. A panel may, in its discretion, decide that no publication worthy of an award has been submitted, and make no award for the year.
4. The basis for making each of the three awards shall be the quality of research, intellectual penetration, and judgment revealed. The primary purpose of the awards is to give recognition to work which advances knowledge through the methods of political science in the fields of (a) government and democracy, (b) international relations, (c) government and human welfare. Although there will be no independent criterion of literary excellence, it is presumed that no publication with a quality of content deserving an award will lack reasonable clarity and conciseness of expression.
5. The Committee shall make a public announcement in January or February of each year inviting authors to submit publications for consideration by one of the panels of the Committee.

III. PRESENTATION OF AWARDS

1. The winner of each of the three awards shall be presented with a scroll at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association.

IV. COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

1. The Committee on Awards shall consist of a general chairman and three panels of five or more members each.
2. The general chairman, to be appointed each year by the president of the American Political Science Association, shall not be a member of any of the panels composing the Committee.
3. The chairman and members for each of the three panels shall be appointed each year by the president of the American Political Science Association, on the basis of nominations made by the Foundation offering the award with which the panel deals.
4. The persons chosen to serve on these panels shall be selected on the basis of their special scholarly work in the field with which the panel deals.

Dr. Donald Young, executive director of the Social Science Research Council since 1945, has been appointed general director of the Russell Sage Foundation succeeding Mr. Shelby Harrison, who retires on June 30 after thirty-five years on the staff of the Foundation.

Professor Taylor Cole, of Duke University, has been awarded a Guggenheim fellowship for a study of the effects of wartime social, economic, and political changes on the civil service of Canada.

Following the resignation of Professor John H. Williams as dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Public Administration, Professor Edward

S. Mason has been appointed to the post. During the conference of foreign ministers at Moscow in March–April, Professor Mason served as chief economic adviser to Secretary George C. Marshall.

Professor John M. Gaus, of the University of Wisconsin, has accepted a professorship at Harvard University, and Professor H. Gordon Skilling an assistant professorship at Dartmouth College.

At the University of Oregon, Professor Eldon L. Johnson, head of the political science department, has become dean of the college of liberal arts and of the graduate school. Dr. Johnson went to Oregon in 1945 from Washington, D. C., where he was director of the graduate school of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Professor Lloyd M. Short, of the University of Minnesota, has been appointed chairman of the Advisory Committee on Social Science Personnel of the U. S. Civil Service Commission, and is also serving as a member of the Land Grant College Association's committee on training for government service.

Professor Harold S. Quigley, of the University of Minnesota, has returned after nine months' service as chief of the Research Division of the Intelligence Section of General MacArthur's staff in Tokyo, and is working on a volume on the new government of Japan. He expects to take up his duties in the department of political science in the fall.

Former Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., who recently received Collier's $10,000 award for distinguished legislative service in 1946, has turned over the sum to the University of Wisconsin to be used in establishing a graduate scholarship for the study of problems of governmental reorganization.

Professor Charles E. Merriam delivered, during the spring quarter, a series of six lectures on the general subject of "Physics and Politics" as a special feature of his regular course at the University of Chicago on American political theory. Mr. Louis Brownlow also gave a series of six lectures on "The President and the Presidency."

The University of Chicago announces the appointment of Dr. Robert Horn, of Harvard University, as assistant professor to develop work in the field of public law.

At Princeton University, Professor Alpheus T. Mason has been promoted to the endowed chair of McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence, long occupied by Professor Edward S. Corwin.

At Iowa State College, Dr. John R. Mashek has been advanced to the rank of full professor.

After four years of government service, Dr. Henry W. Ehrmann, of the Civil Affairs Division, U. S. War Department, has been appointed to an associate professorship at the University of Colorado.

Professor Hollis W. Barber has resigned his position at Tulane University to accept an associate professorship in the Chicago Undergraduate Division of the University of Illinois. During the coming summer, he will be teaching at Urbana.

At Cornell University, Dr. Mario Einaudi has been promoted to a full professorship, and Dr. Clinton L. Rossiter III to an assistant professorship.

Dr. W. Leon Godshall has been promoted to a full professorship at Lehigh University. One year ago he was appointed chairman of the department of international relations, then newly created.

At Northwestern University, Professor Marshall E. Dimock has been given a year's leave of absence commencing in September, 1947. He and Mrs. Dimock plan to live on their farm in Bethel, Vermont, where they will be engaged in research and writing.

Professor Donald B. Leiffer, of Boston University, will teach at the University of California at Los Angeles during the first summer session of 1947, and Professors Howard White, of Miami University, and John A. Vieg, of Pomona College, during the second session.

During the first term of the 1947 summer session at Connecticut College, Professor Hugh A. Bone, of Queens College, will offer a course on American government and another on pressure groups in the United States.

Two graduate courses, dealing with dynamics of American government and the President and Congress, will be offered in the coming summer session of Teachers College, Columbia University, by Professor Wilfred E. Binkley, of Ohio Northern University.

Professor Edwin A. Cottrell, who is retiring this year at Stanford University, has been appointed a trustee and consultant in local and metropolitan government of the John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation of Los Angeles. He will continue as a trustee of the Coro Foundation of San Francisco and act as educational adviser for the internship training of veterans in the city and county government of San Francisco.

Mr. Herbert Emmerich, of the Public Administration Clearing House' Chicago, will attend the summer meeting of the Institute of Public Administration in Great Britain and also the international congresses to be

held by the International Management Institute, the International Institute of Local Authorities, and the International Institute of the Administrative Sciences, as well as the International Exposition of Urbanism and Housing at Paris.

Professor Herbert W. Briggs, of Cornell University, has returned from Turkey, where during April he delivered a series of lectures on "The Progressive Development of International Law" as guest of the Turkish Institute of International Law. Professor Briggs lectured at the Universities of Istanbul and Ankara and at the Turkish General Staff War Academy. The lectures will be published in Turkish and English versions in *Publications of the Turkish Institute of International Law*, Istanbul.

At the Illinois Institute of Technology, the following staff changes have been made in the department of political science: Herbert A. Simon, who has been chairman since September, 1946, has been promoted to the rank of professor and made director of the curriculum in public administration; Donald W. Smithburg has been promoted from instructor to assistant professor; and Victor Thompson, of the University of Texas, has been appointed assistant professor.

Dr. James P. Richardson, Parker professor of law and political science at Dartmouth College, died in Hanover, N. H., on March 24 at the age of sixty-eight. Because of illness, he had been on leave since 1944. In 1925 and 1927, he served as a member of the New Hampshire legislature, in 1928 and 1940 as a delegate to the Republican national convention, and at various times he was a member of investigating commissions, e.g., on taxation and on criminal laws, in his state.

At the University of Texas, Dr. Norton E. Long served as visiting professor of government during the second semester of the current year; and Professors Howard A. Calkins, H. Malcolm Macdonald, and Edward G. Lewis have been promoted to the rank of associate professor. Professor Calkins has also been appointed registration supervisor.

The inauguration of Dr. Raymond B. Allen as president of the University of Washington on May 24 was preceded by a series of conferences on labor relations, atomic energy, and the humanities. Professors Charles E. Martin and Kenneth C. Cole were active in formulating the program—Professor Martin as chairman of the general faculty committee and Professor Cole as chairman of the labor relations committee. Professor Martin presented a paper at the I.P.R. Conference at Coronado, California, on April 11.

At Princeton University, Dr. Kenneth W. Hechler, of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, and Dr. Hubert H. Wilson, of the University of Wisconsin,

have been appointed assistant professors, and Dr. Edgar S. Furniss, of Yale University, and Mr. John S. Reshetar, of Harvard University, have received appointment as instructors.

Dr. Morton M. Grodzins, who has been on the staff of the College of the University of Chicago, has accepted a joint appointment permitting him to give the major part of his time to graduate instruction in political science at the University.

At Ripon College, a separate department of political science has lately been established, with Professor Ludwig A. Freund, associated with the institution since 1937, as chairman. Since the step was taken, however, Dr. Freund has accepted a professorship in Roosevelt College, Chicago.

Dr. Mulford Q. Sibley, of the University of Illinois, will teach "American Political Thought" and "Problems of Democracy" during the first term of the summer session at the University of Minnesota.

Professor Werner Levi, of the University of Minnesota, will go to Australia this summer to carry on research and to give a series of lectures in the political science department of Melbourne University.

Dr. Dale Pontius is acting as consultant to the executive branch committee of the Louisiana Revision Project. Committees set up by the Louisiana Law Institute have been authorized by the legislature to prepare a draft of a new state constitution by March, 1948.

Professor Claude E. Hawley, of the University of Southern California, has been appointed assistant to Mayor Fletcher Bowron of Los Angeles.

Dr. Samuel O. Lane has resigned his position in the Department of State and has joined the faculty of the School of Public Administration, University of Southern California, as an assistant professor.

At the University of Tennessee, Mr. T. W. Goodman has been appointed instructor in political science and Miss Doris Schostal research associate in the Bureau of Public Administration.

Dr. Richard H. Heindel, chief of the Division of Libraries and Institutes in the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, recently returned from a six-week inspection tour in Latin America, where he studied the cultural centers aided by the United States, the three American libraries in Mexico City, Montevideo, and Managua, the teaching of English programs, and matters dealing with art, music, publications, and translations in the public affairs program. Dr. Heindel visited many of the American affiliated schools, and has reported that

there seems to be a broadened market for American books and professional journals such as the REVIEW. Dr. Heindel was formerly associated with the University of Pennsylvania, where he inaugurated courses on the history of American influence abroad.

The Social Science Research Council published in March the first issue of a news bulletin entitled *Items*, to be issued irregularly but probably about every three months. The initial number contained a challenging article by Professor Pendleton Herring on "The Social Sciences in Modern Society."

At its March meeting, the American Society for Public Administration became an associate member of the International Institute of the Administrative Sciences, the American Section of the International Institute becoming a committee of the ASPA. Professor Leonard D. White was elected president of the Society, and Dr. Rowland Egger was appointed editor-in-chief of the *Public Administration Review*.

At Dartmouth College, Professor Donald H. Morrison, whose field of teaching has been public administration, has been appointed dean of the faculty.

The thirteenth annual Northwest Institute of International Relations was held at Reed College, in the interest of adult education in American foreign policy, on June 16–22. President Peter H. Odegard served as chairman.

Professor John D. Millett, of Columbia University, has returned to active duty in the Army of the United States and departed for Germany on May 1. He has been assigned as an assistant to Major General C. F. Robinson, who is in Germany as personal representative of the Under Secretary of War. Professor Millett will return to Columbia for the fall semester.

The American Political Science Association was represented at the National Conference on UNESCO held in Philadelphia on March 24–26 by Professors Charles C. Rohlfing and Philip E. Jacob, of the University of Pennsylvania.

The University of Chicago announces the appointment of Harvey Perloff as associate professor in the Social Science Division and member of the staff in the program of research and education in planning. The central core of this group now consists of Professors R. G. Tugwell, Melville C. Branch, and Harvey Perloff. Other work will be given by Mr. Walter Blucher, director of the American Society of Planning Officials, and by Professors Herman Finer, Louis Wirth, and other members of the Social Science faculty.

A translation of Latin American constitutions will be published during the year by the University of Chicago Press. The book was edited by Professor Russell H. Fitzgibbon, of the University of California, Los Angeles, and Professors Cullen B. Gosnell, William A. Strozier and William B. Stubbs, of Emory University.

Professor Raymond G. McKelvey, of Occidental College, has been named vice-chairman of the Southern California Division, Institute of Pacific Relations.

Dr. George L. Millikan has resigned as assistant professor of government at Louisiana State University to accept an appointment as research associate of the Brookings Institution in Washington, D. C. Professor Millikan will be associated with the International Study Panel of the Institution, a group recently created under the chairmanship of Dr. Leo Pasvolsky, formerly Special Assistant to the Secretary of State. The Study Panel is undertaking a long-range study of the problems of American foreign policy.

Under the chairmanship of Professor G. Homer Durham, director of the Institute of Government at the University of Utah, a meeting of political scientists in the Mountain States will be held at Salt Lake City on November 29, 1947. A program for morning, afternoon, and evening sessions is being prepared and will be announced in August. It is expected that the meeting will result in the creation of a regional unit of political scientists coöperating with the American Political Science Association.

Professor Clarence Senior has been named director of the Social Science Research Center of the University of Puerto Rico to succeed Dr. Rexford G. Tugwell, now director of the Institute of Planning at the University of Chicago.

After eight years as director of the Governmental Research Institute of St. Louis, Dr. Charlton F. Chute resigned in March to become director of the Philadelphia Committee of the Pennsylvania Economy League. His successor at St. Louis is Dr. Victor Brannon, for several years assistant director. The assistant directorship, in turn, has been filled by the return of Dr. Estal E. Sparlin from two years of leave as a staff member of the Missouri legislative research committee assisting with revision legislation under the new Missouri state constitution.

On May 17, Dr. Paul H. Appleby was installed as dean of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University. In connection with the event, a full day's program was carried out, with Professor John M. Gaus, of the University of Wisconsin, Mr. Louis Brownlow, former director of the Public Administration Clearing

House, and Chancellor William P. Tolley, of Syracuse University, presiding at sessions, and with addresses by (among others) Reinhold Niebuhr, of Union Theological Seminary, Herbert Emmerich, present director of the Public Administration Clearing House, T. V. Smith, of the University of Chicago, and finally Dean Appleby himself.

Indiana University will launch in the autumn an area and language program of studies with emphasis on Russia but including also Finno-Ugric languages and cultures. Fellowships will be offered to graduate students, and with the aid of a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation at least one European scholar in the Finno-Ugric field will be brought each year to join the resident staff.

Colgate University has developed since the war a comprehensive program of Latin American courses, as the principal feature of its new Area Studies Program. It now offers a group of eleven courses leading to a baccalaureate degree with concentration in Area Studies (Latin America), and beginning in the fall it will also be possible for a student to work toward the degree of master of arts with concentration in the social, economic, or political aspects of Latin American affairs.

The University of Wisconsin announces a new program of graduate studies leading to the degree of master of arts or of science in regional planning, or alternately constituting a minor for a doctorate. The program was worked out by a committee of which Professor John M. Gaus was a member.

Next September, Harvard University will institute a Regional Program on Soviet Russia designed to make students broadly conversant with the contemporary Russian scene and its essential background, and to give them a firm working knowledge of the language. It will be a graduate program leading to a master's degree, to be attained normally by students already grounded in the language in about two years. Only some twenty students will be admitted to the program each year, and instruction will be given both by regular members of the Harvard faculty and by visiting lecturers. Information may be obtained from Professor Donald C. McKay, Littauer Center 127, Cambridge.

At the beginning of the calendar year, the Library of Congress instituted a new service to libraries and scholars in the form of a *Cumulative Catalogue of Library of Congress Printed Cards* which may be subscribed for at the rate of one hundred dollars per annum. As long ago as 1901, Library of Congress printed catalogue cards were placed on sale to the public, and sales have lately totaled some sixteen million cards a year. Later on, full sets of cards as issued were supplied to some one hundred

libraries free of charge, on condition only that they be kept in order and made available for use. Under the newest arrangement, the distribution of cards will be largely or wholly superseded by subscriptions to the *Cumulative Catalogue*, to be issued nine times a year.

The Bureau of Municipal Research at the University of Texas, founded in 1913, has issued a brochure entitled *A Quarter-Century of Municipal Research*, covering the research projects of the bureau during the period of its existence. Dr. Stuart A. MacCorkle, professor of political science, is the bureau's director.

The Social Science Section of the Ohio College Association met at Antioch College on March 28–29, with Professor V. Carlson, of Antioch, president, in charge. The program included discussions of the labor situation, taxation in Ohio, and revision of utility legislation; also committee reports in connection with a proposed constitutional convention in 1952. S. R. McGowan (political science), Kenyon College, was elected president. E. Kingman Eberhart (economics), College of Wooster, vice-president; and Mona Fletcher (political science), Kent State University, was re-elected secretary-treasurer.

An intensive course conducted for representatives of business corporations on the subject of "American Business in the Middle East" was given at the School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, D. C., March 17–29. The panel of lecturers and leaders of round tables included thirty-one experts from American colleges and universities and the U. S. Departments of State, Commerce, and Agriculture.

With a view to enabling research training programs to be entered upon with a minimum of delay, the Social Science Research Council instituted in 1946 a plan for awarding fellowships at frequent intervals. Included in awards made during the period October 1, 1946, to January 31, 1947, were the following (in nearly all cases for research preparatory to doctoral dissertations): John de Francis (Columbia University), "Political Aspects of Reform in the Chinese Written Language"; Merrill R. Goodall (University of California), "Southern Solidarity in National Politics"; E. Burke Inlow (University of California), "The Evolution of Patents as a Property Right"; Paul M. Kattenbrugh (George Washington University), "The Impact of the Change in Indonesia from Colonial Status to Independence on Contemporary International Relations"; Maurice H. Wells, Jr. (Louisiana State University), "Recent American Critics of Democracy."

Reënforcing the world's most complete collection of documents on recent Spanish history, the Hoover Library on War, Revolution, and Peace

at Stanford University received in February a very large shipment of documentary materials on the post-revolutionary period. More than half consisted of books, pamphlets, and Spanish-language newspapers from the German Cultural Institute in Madrid, long operated by the German embassy and the center of Nazi propaganda in war-time Spain. The remainder was composed of documents covering the Franco régime since 1929 and also the Spanish civil war from the Franco side, with, in addition, a collection of materials on the current anti-Franco underground movement. How these underground papers were got out of the country is said to be a Library secret.

On recommendation of the United Nations Nuclear Commission on Human Rights, with the approval of the Economic and Social Council, and under the direction of Professor B. Mirkine-Guetzévitch, consultant to the United Nations Secretariat, a yearbook on human rights is being compiled by a group of scholars, diplomats, lawyers, and journalists. The publication is planned to include complete texts of all declarations and bills of rights throughout the world; constitutional texts concerning individual and social freedom throughout the world, apart from the bills of rights; the principal laws on individual and social freedom promulgated in 1946; and the texts of constitutions of federated states, such as the Swiss cantons, the Soviet Socialist republics, the forty-eight states of the United States, and the Latin American republics.

The Department of State *Bulletin*, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The *Bulletin* includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest are included. Publications of the Department, cumulative lists of which are published at the end of each quarter, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently. The *Bulletin* may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, at an annual subscription rate of $5.00.

From June, 1946, through March, 1947, Dr. Pendleton Herring served as secretary of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission at Lake

Success, New York. He was director of the Atomic Energy Commission Group in the Department of Security Affairs of the United Nations. He assumed this position for a limited period of leave from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and directed the Secretariat's work on the First Report of the Atomic Energy Commission to the Security Council. The Council finished its consideration of this report by the end of March, 1947. Dr. Herring resigned his post as secretary of the Graduate School of Public Administration and his professorship in the department of government at Harvard University, where he had been on the faculty since 1928, to join the Carnegie Corporation as executive associate last spring. The Corporation is now particularly concerned with the support of social science research, with area and international studies, and with programs enabling our universities to extend their sphere of usefulness to the community and to government. Dr. Herring is handling various phases of this work at the Corporation's offices, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Compilation of biographies for the second edition of the *Directory of the American Political Science Association*, to be published in 1948, has begun under the editorship of Franklin L. Burdette, of the University of Maryland. Questionnaires for biographical information are being sent to members of the Association who have joined since publication of the first edition. Members whose biographies are printed in the first edition will be asked to revise their sketches shortly before the volume goes to press. Editorial costs of the project are being borne by the National Foundation for Education, of which Samuel R. Harrell of Indianapolis is chairman. Members of the Association are requested to nominate for membership colleagues who should be listed in this standard professional *Directory*.

The Fifth Conference of Midwest Political Scientists was held at the University of Notre Dame, May 2, 3, and 4. After an address of welcome by Notre Dame's president, John J. Cavanaugh, the opening session on Friday evening was addressed by President Arthur W. Macmahon of the American Political Science Association on "Functional Needs and the Problem of a Unified Foreign Service," and by Dr. William P. Maddox, director of the Foreign Service Institute, U. S. Department of State, on "The Foreign Service of Tomorrow." Five "Significant Developments in the Midwest" were discussed in the same number of informal group meetings on Saturday morning. The respective group subjects were: "State Constitutional Revision," "Improvement of State Legislatures," "State Administrative Organization," "The Progressive Movement," and "Municipal Finance Problems." In the afternoon general session, "Citizenship Education for Today and Tomorrow," was the theme, selected for its appeal not only to political scientists but to teachers of social studies in secondary schools, who were especially invited to participate in this

session. After addresses by Elmer F. Pflieger on "The Detroit Citizenship Study," and by Robert A. Walker on "Citizenship Education and the Colleges," there were four round tables dealing with, respectively, "Teaching American Government in the High School," "General Social Science Courses on the Junior College Level," "Teaching International Relations in High School and College," and "Training Teachers of Government for High School and College." The Saturday evening session was devoted to "Government and Labor-Management Relations," with addresses by Henry H. Bolz, chairman, Labor Relations Council of Chambers of Commerce of the U. S., Kermit Eby, director, Department of Education and Research, CIO, and Boris Shishkin, economist, AFL. At the annual business meeting (the last previous one was in May, 1942), officers for the year were chosen. Placed on the Managerial Committee were Harold Zink (*chairman*), Phillips Bradley, William L. Bradshaw, LaVerne Burchfield, Herbert C. Cook, Reuel G. Hemdahl, Llewellyn Pfankuchen, and Howard White. Members of the Program Committee are E. Allen Helms (*chairman*), Paul C. Bartholomew, Marshall Dimock, Marshall M. Knappen, William S. Shepherd, and Hilda Watters. The secretary-treasurer, who succeeds to the post held by Harold Zink since the establishment of the Conference, is Harry W. Voltmer. The final session occupied the remainder of Sunday morning after the business meeting was concluded. Harold M. Vinacke spoke on occupation policies in Japan and on relations between the United States and Russia in the Far East; Harold Zink analyzed occupation policies of the United States in Germany; and Waldemar Gurian discussed United States-Russian relations in Europe. Several other members of the Conference participated in the discussion, and many questions were directed to James K. Pollock, who had been asked to make a brief statement on the situation in Germany. Attendance at the fifth exceeded that at preceding Midwest Conferences, with over 150 registrations. Llewellyn Pfankuchen was chairman of the committee which planned the program; Robert E. Keohane organized the Saturday afternoon sessions, and Phillips Bradley the Saturday night program; and Paul C. Bartholomew was chairman of the committee on local arrangements.—HOWARD WHITE.

Opportunities in Naval Research. The Navy Department has taken the lead in encouraging private research in its rich collection of documents. On March 8, 1947, the representatives of 26 learned societies and other interested groups held an all-day meeting at the Navy Department at the invitation of Secretary of the Navy James V. Forrestal. As expressed by Mr. Forrestal, the purposes of the meeting were to inform the representatives of the present naval historical program, to indicate further studies which should be made and the material on which these could be based, and

to enlist the aid of the societies in promoting sound naval historical writings.

The conference included an opening welcome by Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz; statements outlining the accomplishments and plans of the Navy Department in operational and administrative history; a description and inspection of the vast files of the Office of Naval Records and the first narratives available in the Office of Naval History; an afternoon round-table discussion of the usefulness of naval research materials to outside scholars; and an evening dinner at the Army and Navy Club, at which Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King addressed the conference on the utility of naval history.

The administrative histories completed and in preparation are of particular interest to political scientists. The Historian for Naval Administration, Dr. Robert G. Albion of Princeton University, is now working on a two to three volume over-all history of the administration of the Navy Department from its establishment in 1798 to the present. It is expected that the first volume, covering the period to the eve of World War II, will be ready by April 30, 1948, in time for the 150th anniversary of the founding of the Department. A number of more specialized studies, covering such subjects as naval logistics, procurement, and personnel, will be published during the coming year. The fact that scholars like Robert H. Connery are working on these supporting volumes guarantees a high standard in the final product.

The Office of Naval History has also collected and bound approximately 200 typescript volumes representing the administrative history of the naval bureaus and offices, overseas bases, task forces, naval districts, and field offices. Some 50 supplementary volumes cover pertinent directives and documents, manuals, publications, and photographs. These narratives cover such a wide range of subjects as to defy a summary. Among the subjects touched are assembly and delivery of men, food, stores, equipment, spare parts, and ammunition; the building of additions to the Fleet and maintenance of the Fleet; the planning and construction of advanced bases; transportation, communications, intelligence, internal security, naval aviation organization, accounting and disbursing, medical and hospital care—to mention only a sample few. These first narratives were written for two purposes: to guide the future researcher into the voluminous files of the commands, and to serve as manuals for future administrators and students.

The published volumes in the administrative history program will be unclassified and easily obtainable. Steps are being taken to declassify many of the typescript first narratives mentioned above. Until recently, the official policy was that "the narratives are available only to specifically authorized naval and military personnel." The Navy Department has

not yet made clear how far it will go in allowing access to these narratives, or in lending copies, say, to a student on the West Coast who is unable to make a trip to Washington, D. C. Nevertheless, Captain John B. Heffernan, Director of Naval History, indicated that he welcomed requests from outsiders interested in these materials.

The general value of these first narratives, of course, varies with the professional competence of the writer. Yet each narrative—whether of a bureau, a frontier, a district, or a fleet—has tried to reach the laudable goal of showing what the organizational and administrative problems were in each case; what solutions were tested and found ineffective; and what policy changes resulted from the final determination of the correct solution. The bulk of the files in the Office of Naval Records comprise operational documents such as war diaries, action reports, submarine war patrol reports, aircraft action reports, and operation plans. The files of the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commander-in-Chief, U. S. Fleet, are also contained in the Office of Naval Records. The National Archives houses the naval operational records prior to 1927 and the administrative records up to a more recent date.

The Navy Department has taken a progressive attitude toward declassifying these materials and allowing outside scholars to use them. The two present blocks to declassification are those documents which discuss the actual performance of American weapons and those which involve security of communications. Much progress has already been made, however, and the Navy announced that it would encourage requests by students to obtain access to these materials.

Substantial progress has been made in collecting German and Japanese naval records. The Archives of the German Admiralty since 1850 and the Library of the German Naval Academy both were captured almost intact by the Allies, and are being shared by Great Britain and the United States. Many of these documents are still in England, but it is expected that microfilming processes will guarantee duplicates for both countries. Following examination of the documents by American and British officers, they are being translated, and eventually will be turned over to the historical services of the British Admiralty and the Navy Department.

For a number of reasons, the Japanese records are not as complete as the German records. They were never as complete in the first instance, because the Japanese were not as meticulously thorough in recording events and plans. Apparently Japanese officials destroyed a larger proportion of the records than did the Germans, and the B-29 raids on Tokyo destroyed a substantial percentage. In addition, Japanese translators are not as numerous as German translators, and this also delays availability.

Although there has been a free exchange of records between British and

American authorities, there has been little or no exchange between the U.S.S.R. and her Allies.

Both the Navy and the Marine Corps are attempting to obtain the personal letters and other personal files of high-ranking officers. The Naval Historical Foundation is coöperating in this effort. The importance of collections like the diary and personal letters of Gideon Welles in interpreting the period can hardly be exaggerated. Nevertheless, the Navy Department has not been completely successful in this attempt, for the prize collection of the period—the personal letters of Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox—are apparently in the hands of the Knox family.

The Office of Naval History plans to develop a list of possible topics for master and doctoral dissertations, which will be available to scholars in the field. It is hoped that such a file will serve as a standby list of public works projects which can be constructed when the facilities become available.

All inquiries pertaining to academic studies in the field of naval history, and requests for the use of records, should be addressed to: Director of Naval History, 1224 Navy Department, EXOS, Washington 25, D. C. The Office of Naval History announces that it will gladly consider on an individual basis proposals for studies in this field, and that questions of security classification can be taken up at the time of the request.

The gradual liquidation of the war history program throughout the federal government, and the indication that public funds for research will grow smaller, lends a new importance to the plans announced by the Navy Department at the March 8 conference. The burden of distilling the knowledge derived from our wartime experiences will fall increasingly on private research. The Navy Department is to be congratulated upon taking the initiative in stimulating private research in its materials, and it is to be hoped that other agencies of the Government will take an equally liberal attitude toward their own records and research opportunities.—KENNETH W. HECHLER.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

States and Morals; A Study in Political Conflicts. By T. D. Weldon. (London: John Murray. 1946. Pp. xi, 302. $2.75. Distributed in the United States by the Public Affairs Book Service, Washington, D. C.)

The purpose of political philosophy, as Mr. Weldon conceives it in this book, is "to discover the grounds on which the State claims to exercise authority over its members" (p. 1). Political philosophies divide upon this question into two opposed classes, the organic and the mechanical. According to the organic theories, the State is defined as society organized into a sovereign political body, a natural individual superior to and more valuable than the individuals who are its citizens (p. 29). The mechanical theories differ from this in regarding the State as an organization within society to accomplish specific purposes which are set by some or all of the members as individuals. Theories which regard the State as a mechanism are further subdivided by Mr. Weldon into those which define it in terms of force and those which justify its authority in terms of the consent of the governed. The last is the class of democratic theories. Organic theories are exemplified by Aristotle, Rousseau, and Hegel; force-theories by Hobbes and Marx; democratic theories by Locke. In effect, however, Mr. Weldon's discussion turns upon the contrast between organic and democratic states. He concedes that there are no states that depend wholly on force. Russia and Germany are organic states; Great Britain and the United States are democratic states.

In point of fact this rather wire-drawn ideological classification does not fairly represent the best qualities of Mr. Weldon's book. He is not misled by his own formalism, and his discussion of specific questions is in general quite concrete and realistic. Sometimes it qualifies the formalism to a point where the reader does not know quite what is left of it. The general thesis of the book might be stated as follows: between Russian and German government on the one hand and English and American government, there is a fundamental difference, viz., that the former regard human beings as expendible for the purposes of the organized society, while the latter regard organization as means for securing values which in the last resort must accrue to individuals. An interesting subsidiary point in this connection is Mr. Weldon's contrast of British with American democracy. American democracy, he believes, because of its dependence on the "atomic" individualism of the eighteenth century, is prone to think of the equal rights of men as such rather than of the rights of a distinct personality, and in practice to lean toward legalism and a somewhat drab conformity. Perhaps an American will think of the Navaho saying that "all white women look alike."

Mr. Weldon construes the difference between organic and democratic

governments as a fundamental incompatibility of moral valuations, an irreconcilable discrepancy between different judgments of individual worth. These discrepancies cannot be removed by argument, because in the end they do not depend on either rational or empirical discriminations. Mr. Weldon's theory of moral value is therefore similar to (though not an imitation of) the moral-sense intuitionism of Shaftesbury, Hutcheson, or Hume. Moral judgments are of the nature of what Hume called "sentiments." They are produced rather by psychological conditioning than by logical argument. From these premises Mr. Weldon deduces several important practical conclusions: democratic government cannot exist in, or be successfully imported into, a population that does not hold democratic values; the reconditioning of a population with other values may be possible, but will certainly be slow and difficult; since valuations rest on sentiment, argument about them between persons with divergent valuations produces exasperation but not agreement.

The fundamental question in international relations concerns the way in which nations can live together peacefully when they are in irreconcilable disagreement on the fundamentals of morals. Practically, this question means for Mr. Weldon: Are Russia and the United States going to fight an ideological religious crusade? His recipe for avoiding it is statesmanship—the avoidance of debate about insoluble moral differences and of propaganda for irreconcilable systems of value, the keeping of national intercourse on the level of second-level questions where compromise is possible and discussion can lead to agreement. His analog for this solution is the rise of religious tolerance in the seventeenth century, where likewise the competing moral valuations were incompatible. It seems to me that he omits one historical factor in this analog. In the seventeenth century, statesmanship could deal with intolerance because a growing sense of national unity supplied an increasing force of political cohesion that tended to dwarf religious differences. What similar cohesive force, extending across national lines, can the statesman now depend upon and foster?

GEORGE H. SABINE.

Cornell University.

Democratic Capitalism. By DAVID W. RAUDENBUSH. (New York: The John Day Company. 1946. Pp. xi, 338. $3.50.)

Accepting James Burnham's thesis that both business and government are coming under the control of the "managerial" class (*The Managerial Revolution*, New York, 1941), and viewing postwar developments in Europe as confirmation of this trend, Mr. Raudenbush offers a thoughtful proposal which he believes will enable capitalism to democratize itself and, by moving into a new phase, to escape "managerialism." The author

frankly admits and fully enumerates the shortcomings of present-day finance capitalism. He is particularly concerned about its inability to distribute purchasing power properly and to prevent unemployment, and about the stifling of competition by cartels.

His plan of reform is a combination of consumer-coöperation, profit-sharing, and employee-ownership. He proposes retroactive adjustment of wages and prices, thus distributing profits equally (at first) among a corporation's stockholders, employees, and customers. To help in attaining his goal of economic decentralization, he would outlaw the holding company and restrict the privilege of stock ownership in corporations to their full-time employees. Realizing that his plan would never be adopted "spontaneously," Mr. Raudenbush suggests new federal income tax laws imposing a tax of 66.6 per cent on the net income of all corporations engaged in business for profit, but exempting those which could show that they had distributed one-third of their net profits to their employees and one-third to their customers. There would also be a special tax on income realized from voting stock "held by a taxpayer not a natural person employed on a full-time basis by the corporation." The author favors flexible wage control by government boards, even after the "management-labor group" becomes identical with the "stockholding group."

Mr. Raudenbush claims that his plan would stimulate demand and competition, make the economy more resilient, "preserve a healthy balance" between comsumption and investment (thereby helping to ward off depression), and provide a growing volume of economic statistics which would reduce the margin of error in business judgments. Among supplementary measures, he includes expansion of the category of "businesses affected with a public interest" (although apparently overlooking the vital fact that affectation with public interest already brings a business under very extensive, not slight, government regulation), reduction of the hours of labor to keep pace with technology, amendment of the patent laws to compel production of the patented device, governmental establishment of research laboratories available for individual use, and joint investment by government and business in certain types of enterprises.

Despite his painstaking thoroughness, which includes careful consideration of the international aspects of his plan, Mr. Raudenbush fails to answer the crucial question: How could Congress ever be prevailed upon to enact such a plan into law? While the author seems to be aware of pressure groups, he fails to recognize that they are so strongly entrenched as to make his plan a political impossibility. Certainly consumers are politically impotent, and it seems clear that even labor cannot match the power of great corporations and combines. This reviewer cannot share the author's view that the size of "production units" is unimportant once finance-capitalist control is eliminated, nor agree with him when he calls Hayek's discussion "brilliant." In his determination to avoid "managerialism" and

"bureaucracy," Mr. Raudenbush would employ so many government controls and "inducements" that it is difficult to see where "democratic capitalism" ends and "managerialism" begins. Indeed, he falls into many semantic traps in his employment of terms such as "planning," "liberty," and "political." In effect, he offers a plan to avoid "planning."

However, it must be said in all fairness that the author has displayed great imagination and sincerity in coming to grips with the actual facts of so large and complex a problem. He should not be blamed because others will lack the wisdom to give his proposal a fair trial.

CARLTON C. RODEE.

University of Southern California.

A Free and Responsible Press; A General Report on Mass Communication: Newspapers, Radio, Motion Pictures, Magazines, and Books. BY THE COMMISSION ON FREEDOM OF THE PRESS. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1947. Pp. 139. $2.00.)

This is the general, summary report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press set up in 1943 at the suggestion of Henry R. Luce of Time, Inc., to inquire into "the present state and future prospects of the freedom of the press." The Commission consisted of Robert M. Hutchins, chairman, Zechariah Chafee, Jr., John M. Clark, John Dickinson, William E. Hocking, Harold D. Lasswell, Archibald MacLeish, Charles E. Merriam, Reinhold Niebuhr, Robert Redfield, Beardsley Ruml, Arthur M. Schlesinger, and George N. Shuster. The staff of the Commission comprised Robert D. Leigh, director, Llewellyn White, assistant director, Ruth A. Inglis, and Milton D. Stewart. Associated with the Commission were four foreign advisers: John Grierson, Hu Shih, Jacques Maritain, and Kurt Riezler.

The inquiry was financed by grants of $200,000 from Time, Inc., and $15,000 from Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. The scope was broadened to include all agencies of mass communication, and whenever the word "press" is used in the report it refers to all these media. In his foreword, Dr. Hutchins states that the Commission did not try to conduct elaborate "research." It merely sought facts "to fill out gaps in its information or to answer questions which arose in the course of its discussions." In full session or in committee, it heard testimony from 58 persons connected with the press, and the staff recorded interviews with more than 225 persons from industry, government, and private agencies. The Commission held 17 two-day or three-day meetings and studied 176 documents prepared by its members or the staff.

The gist of the Commission's argument seems to be that if those in charge of our mass communication agencies do not wake up to their public responsibilities and seek to meet the communication needs of modern society, there is a real danger that government control will be extended,

and that freedom of the press will be lost. One of the principal contributions of the report is the Commission's definition of the communication requirements of modern society as follows: (1) a truthful, comprehensive, and intelligent account of the day's events in a context which gives them meaning; (2) a forum for the exchange of comment and criticism; (3) the projection of a representative picture of the constituent groups in society; (4) the presentation and clarification of the goals and values of society; and (5) full access to the day's intelligence.

The Commission concludes its report with a list of thirteen recommendations designed to free the press "from the influences which now prevent it from supplying the communication of news and ideas needed by the kind of society we have." It asks the government to do five things: (1) extend the constitutional guarantees of press freedom to radio and motion pictures; (2) facilitate new ventures in the communications industry, maintain competition therein, and see that the public gets the benefit of large-scale operations; (3) improve the libel laws; (4) repeal the peacetime sedition clauses of the Alien Registration Act of 1940 and state syndicalist laws; and (5) make whatever use of mass media is necessary to tell other countries about the United States and to keep the American people informed regarding government policies.

The Commission also asks the press itself to do five things: (1) accept the responsibilities of common carriers of information and discussion; (2) finance new, experimental activities; (3) engage in vigorous mutual criticism; (4) increase the competence, independence, and effectiveness of its staff; and (5) have radio take control of its programs and treat advertising "as it is treated by the best newspapers."

The public's responsibilities in the matter, according to the Commission, are three-fold: (1) to have non-profit institutions help to supply the variety, quantity, and quality of communication services needed; (2) to set up professional centers of advanced study, research, and publication in the communications field; and (3) to establish a new and independent agency to appraise and report annually upon the performance of the press. "Although government has an important part to play in communications, we look principally to the press and the people to remedy the ills which have chiefly concerned us" (p. 3).

Limitations of space preclude a detailed analysis of the Commission's findings. Certainly there will be those who will find many debatable propositions in the report, notwithstanding the unanimity of the distinguished members of the Commission. Throughout the report, one senses the Commission's difficulty in trying to reconcile the communication needs of modern society with private ownership and control of the agencies of mass communication. Repeatedly affirming its faith in private enterprise and its fear of government control, the Commission insists nevertheless that the business of mass communications is "affected with a public interest,"

and asks for considerable extension of governmental activity. The Commission's failure to define clearly the respective rôles of government and private enterprise is one of the principal shortcomings of the report. It is unsatisfactory to leave the whole matter, as the Commission apparently does, with the statement (p. 131): "The situation approaches a dilemma. The press must remain private and free, ergo human and fallible; but the press dare no longer indulge in fallibility—it must supply the public need. Here, again, there is no perfect solution."

Has the Commission, in defining the communication requirements of modern society, made unreasonable demands on the press? The standards are admittedly high, but the argument of the Commission that they are essential is convincing. However, the assertion (p. 91), with virtually no proof, that private enterprise can meet these needs at a profit is not so convincing. Moreover, the list of thirteen recommendations, calling on government and non-profit organizations to supplement private enterprise in this field, suggests that the Commission itself realizes it is not always true that "good practice in the interest of public enlightenment is good business as well."

What are the prospects that those in control of the agencies of mass communication will heed the warnings of the Commission? Experience in this and other fields would suggest that the threat of government control is a powerful aid to reform. But is this threat so far as communication agencies are concerned a real and dangerous one? In the opinion of the Commission, it is. But is it in the minds of private owners of mass communications? Probably not, since there is little evidence that the public generally is so aroused as to produce a change in the existing state of mind of congressmen. Neither public opinion polls nor the statements of public officials suggest the likelihood of a fundamental change in governmental policy in the near future. In the absence of a real threat of government control, the dilemma of the Commission is an illusion, and the prospect that mass communication agencies will really do anything to meet the communication needs of society a pious hope. The real problem is to raise the standards demanded by the public, to educate the masses to a desire for something better. When that happens, those in charge of mass communication will act or else!

HARWOOD L. CHILDS.

Princeton University.

Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations; A Budget of Suggestions for Research. BY WILLIAM ANDERSON. (Chicago: Public Administration Service. 1946. Pp. x, 192. $2.00.)

This volume by the former chairman of the Committee on Public Administration and the Committee on Government of the Social Science Research Council has been long in gestation. It was begun some years ago

by the first committeee as one of its contributions to the stimulation of research. It has been built upon memoranda upon the subject prepared by various scholars, including particularly a joint memorandum developed by Professors George Graham and Herman Finer. Four years ago, Professor Anderson took over the task of carrying the project to completion, and he has succeeded admirably in fulfilling the purposes implicit in so comprehensive a subject for research.

The purpose of the work amply justifies the time, effort, and intelligence which have gone into it. While it continually calls attention to the need for the exploration of comparative experience in other federal systems, past as well as extant, the center of interest in Anderson's essays, hypotheses, and suggestions is the American scene. What is intended is to set in motion a great work of diagnosis, a thorough, searching, objective investigation of every important aspect of the relations among and between the national, state, and local governments. Despite the extensive bibliography available, Anderson correctly calls attention to the scarcity of first quality publication about federalism and the other intergovernmental relations in the United States. Most of the material, as he notes, has been concerned chiefly with constitutional and legal issues, even though the settlement of such questions prepares the stage for "subsequent action that may be far more significant."

Like the other research outlines developed by the Committee on Public Administration, this work is much more than a list of suggestions intended to titillate the research appetite. It is indeed replete with research ideas. But it is also a collection of partly completed essays on the many phases of federalism problems and of inter-governmental relations, which at times summarize the evolution of governmental experience (particularly American) relating thereto, or which set the stage for the meditation on various hypotheses which scholars may find fruitful in planning and prosecuting their inquiries.

The scope of the issues considered may be indicated by reciting the chief topics treated. These include: the fundamental characteristics of federal systems as well as other forms of union, theories of federalism and of other intergovernmental relations (including questions of uniformity and diversity of public needs and services, the issues of centralization and decentralization, and the arguments, pro and con, on federalism put forth by distinguished publicists since the days of 1787), constitutional and legal problems (such as the functions of judicial review in the enforcement of powers distributed by the "higher law," formal amendment processes, and the divisions of functions between nation and state), the rôle of the electorate in federalism, the issue of responsible government and the separation of powers, the question of majority rule and extraordinary majority requirements, the structural interdependence of nation and

states, legislative organization and processes in federal systems (including state and local legislative relations), executive relations (horizontal as well as vertical), judicial structure, power and relations under federalism, the characteristics and adequacy of the states in a federal system, local-government relations with national as well as state entities, regionalism possibilities and alternatives, intergovernmental fiscal relations (a very acutely discussed and extensively treated topic), foreign affairs and national defense, and the principal internal functions of the modern state (the control of banking, money, industry, utilities, commerce, natural resources, and agriculture, the protection of persons, property, business, and labor, and activities on behalf of health, education, welfare, and social insurance). A final chapter proposes the re-examination, in the light of recently acquired historical knowledge, of the early European and American confederations. It likewise pushes in front of the research nose the temptation to measure boldly the future prospects for a world federal system, a task calling not only for scholarship but for constructive and prophetic imagination. Despite the limitations of data surrounding such a subject, Anderson feels that studies looking toward the international application of federalism "may be more important than any others in this outline."

The book is not easy reading. Every one of the hundreds of questions raised is a warning signal—a "stop-look-and-listen" impediment to the enjoyment of ready-made solutions of the problems under review. If at times the queries seem too numerous, second thought makes evident their purpose not to allow by omission the loss of some possible fruitful hypothesis or the bias that silence sometimes creates.

Ruminations about the volume naturally turn on the prospect of obtaining the kind of far-flung advance in our knowledge of intergovernmental relations that is intended and so greatly needed. The accretions produced by isolated individual scholars are so slow in coming, and so often unrelated, that some other method of organizing for research in this area may be warranted. The Canadian Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations was doubtless precipitated by the impasse created when the Judicial Committee of the British Privy Council invalidated the Bennett "New Deal" program. Nevertheless, research monographs prepared by the company of scholars assembled by the Commission lay the foundation for the informed reëxamination of the entire gamut of powers (and of the inter-governmental relations associated with their exercise) distributed between the dominion and provincial organs of the Canadian federal union. Is there not a good case for a similar Domesday survey of the comparable aspects of federalism in the United States?

CHARLES MCKINLEY.

Reed College.

Economic Policy and Full Employment. By Alvin H. Hansen. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1947. Pp. xii, 340.)

Planning and Paying for Full Employment. Edited by Abba P. Lerner and Frank D. Graham. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1946. Pp. 222. $3.00.)

Three documents mark the initial steps of the federal government under the Employment Act of 1946. One is the first annual report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, an engaging essay on the political philosophy of the statute, the economic philosophy of sustained employment, and the outlook for production and jobs. Here the Economic Council rejects both the "Spartan doctrine of *laissez-faire*" and the "Roman doctrine of an external remedy"—to wit, "manipulation" of government spending and taxing as the modern counterpart to "bread and circuses"—in favor of "American democracy's doctrine of mutual adjustment." The second document, more comprehensive as well as more important, is the Economic Report of the President, prepared with "the advice and assistance" not only of his Economic Council, but also of "members of the cabinet and heads of independent agencies." This report, supported by graphs and tables, reviews the record of 1946, outlines the nation's "economic budget," identifies the goals for 1947, and sets forth recommendations for a short-range and a long-range program. The third document is the three-page report of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report. Although allying itself with "the President's hope that business will reduce prices, that labor will refrain from excessive wage demands, and that both will bend every effort to increase productivity," the Committee declares most of his short-range proposals "highly controversial" and, like his long-range recommendations, in need of further study. However, the Committee commends "the compilation of statistics and economic facts" in the President's report as "a substantial basis" for its own inquiries.

These documents, being of more recent date, have remained outside the range of the two books under review. The earlier one, *Planning and Paying for Full Employment*, is a series of papers brought together for a meeting of economists called in 1944 by the American Labor Conference on International Affairs, and later published in *International Postwar Problems*, the journal of the American Labor Conference. Two of the papers have attracted particular attention. The first is Frank D. Graham's ingenious suggestion for supporting sagging markets by Federal Reserve Bank purchases of liens on unsold inventories of standard storable goods. The other is Abba P. Lerner's application of the "functional finance" approach to the problem of full employment—"functional finance" meaning simply the planning of the financial activities of the government with a view to

their effects rather than their compatibility with "traditional canons of fiscal propriety" (pp. 163-164). The value of the book as a helpful introduction is considerably enhanced by Albert Halasi's illuminating survey of the scope of agreement and disagreement among the contributors to the symposium.

Critical analysis of unresolved issues is developed further in Alvin Hansen's latest study. His treatment is more comprehensive, though at quite a few points he assumes familiarity with his previous writings. Compensatory fiscal policy is a centerpiece in his reasoning, but he takes pains to show that this policy requires "responsible management" to control expenditures, taxes, and borrowing "so as to promote stability" (p. 11). He meets the "bogey of economic maturity" by drawing attention to the need for "a great national program of development" and the "rich fields for private investment" that would open up with it (p. 23). Moreover, as he puts it, the United States still is "incredibly deficient" in the areas of health, nutrition, education, and housing (p. 167). He sees the "true wealth of a nation" in its "capacity to produce a high real income." From such an angle, "scientific knowledge, skills, technical training, personal health and efficiency, social unity, and capacity to coöperate are of prime importance. Programs that contribute to the development of a society that has these characteristics in high degree are surely even more basic to the promotion of national wealth than mere brick and mortar" (pp. 185-186). Throughout his book, Hansen lays heavy stress on the need for a long-range point of view. "There is a strong disposition on the part of many to say that with the postwar restocking boom confronting us, it is nonsense to talk about full-employment measures. But we shall never grow up to our task of keeping the economy on a high and stable level if we persist in concentrating exclusive attention upon the present" (p. 251).

Both books, it should be noted, show a remarkable degree of sensitivity to political realities. Time and again a line of thought pronounced economically sound is abandoned when found unlikely to win popular acceptance. Eduard Heimann, in his contribution to the symposium, hints at the reason by speaking of the "increasing and disastrous" estrangement between public opinion and academic economics (p. 99). Yet, whatever their sense of proportion, economists share with political scientists an inescapable obligation to make plain the crucial character of coherence in program for the success of any forward-looking policy of high-level employment. This problem is linked with the general question of to what an extent consistent pursuit of long-range objectives may be insured under conditions of popular government. There is little doubt that an integrated executive branch under one elective head can make great strides toward evolving a widely inclusive and coherent program. Of still greater importance for democracy's ability to bring forth such programs is the

capacity of political parties for achieving within themselves a synthesis of divergent interests and aims. Recent moves toward legislative reorganization have been steps in this direction. Ultimately decisive, however, is the effectiveness of policy formulation and internal control in both of our major parties. One cannot talk fruitfully about full employment without ending with this vital theme.

FRITZ MORSTEIN MARX.

U. S. Bureau of the Budget.

Relief and Social Security. By LEWIS MERIAM. (Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution. 1946. Pp. xx, 912. $5.00.)

The years immediately preceding and following the adoption of the emergency relief programs in the early 1930's, and the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935, saw the publication of many books and monographic studies dealing with general or special phases of the field of social legislation. Almost all of this writing was, however, limited to a discussion of either the need for social security or social insurance programs in the United States, or an analysis of foreign programs and experience (and how this experience might or should guide American policy formulation.) Mr. Meriam's book, with the possible exception of *Security, Work, and Relief Policies*, published in 1942, is the first comprehensive analysis of the present content of American relief and social security programs and how they came into being, the development and present status of similar programs in Great Britain and New Zealand, and the basic issues now confronting our planners and policy-makers.

In Part I, Mr. Meriam presents a full—one might say almost encyclopaedic—survey of the development of emergency and long-time policies of relief, public assistance, and social insurance in the United States, with greatest emphasis on the years 1930 to 1945. The factors, social and economic, constitutional and political, influential in the shaping of these policies are fully and critically discussed, and there is a very adequate consideration of the alternatives that might have been considered and adopted. Perhaps the most serious criticism that can be leveled against this section of the book is that certain omissions are difficult to explain. The Federal Emergency Relief Administration receives but scant attention, although the work relief program of 1935 and after is treated fully. The former had, as is well known, a profound effect, not only upon federal action, but also upon state policy and administration. Workman's compensation is not mentioned, perhaps because it was a fully established state program by the 1930's. But in the field of social security legislation it certainly is equal in importance to the national civil service retirement system, which rates a chapter of the book. Finally, although health insurance is as yet not a part of our social security program, the widespread discussion that it has evoked, the serious consideration given to

one or another of the versions of the Wagner-Murray-Dingle bills, and the beginnings of health disability insurance, albeit linked to unemployment compensation, indicate the appropriateness of a fuller discussion than is included in the volume under review.

All students of social legislation will welcome the very able survey of the social security programs of Great Britain and New Zealand that make up Part II of Mr. Meriam's study. This includes a full analysis of past programs in Great Britain, as well as the proposals that came forward in 1946 as a result of the Beveridge Report. Persons principally concerned with American problems will find the discussions of variants in principle and policy that exist among the three nations both illuminating and incisive.

Undoubtedly Part III will stir the most controversy. It is the author's thesis that the United States should plan for and adopt a national (in terms of coverage and not policy control), comprehensive, and coördinated system of social security; and with this thesis there will be little argument. The view is bulwarked by a full and analytical consideration of the factors that must be weighed and considered, including social and political considerations, the cost of the program and who should bear it, administrative problems, and the mutual rôles and responsibilities of the nation and the states. The conclusions arrived at by the author, however, will be challenged by many. Endorsement of a means test as a base upon which the program should rest will be looked upon by some as a serious retrogression. It should be noted at this point that the author fully discusses this issue, and supports his position by noting the questionable social policy of spending limited funds to pay benefits to those not in need. Many who hold too closely to the analogy that is supposed to exist between private and social insurance will fail to agree with Mr. Meriam's suggestion that a flat income tax be substituted for payroll and employee taxes. Others, and this reviewer is among them, will question the assumption that federal power, in policy determination and administration, will lead to political manipulation of the social security system. Many studies in the field of national-state relationships in the United States do not support the view that in grant-in-aid programs federal standards should be restricted to minimal requirements. The developments in old age assistance and unemployment compensation at least give some evidence that the raising of state standards depends upon federal prescription.

It should be noted, however, that all of the positions taken by the author are most patiently and fully supported by the data he has gathered and examined. The comprehensiveness of his book, its objectivity, and the assembling of data and facts to support conclusions, combine to make this volume one of the most significant contributions of recent years.

ASHER N. CHRISTENSEN.

University of Minnesota.

Selected Letters of William Allen White. EDITED BY WALTER JOHNSON. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1947. Pp. viii, 460. $3.75.)

Students of government and politics will welcome this volume as a valuable addition to what bids fair to be a considerable literature about the world-famous editor from Main Street, U. S. A. (Emporia, Kansas). *Selected Letters* admirably supplements William Allen White's *Autobiography* published last year; for more than half of this selection of letters is devoted to the period after 1920 where the *Autobiography* ended. The collection, however, begins with 1899, shortly after White had first come into the national limelight.

Mr. Johnson's book is what it purports to be—*Selected Letters*, not a complete compilation. While this undoubtedly adds to the color and interest of the collection, it surely omits much material which would be valuable to political scientists. Students of "pressure politics," as well as those with particular interests in international politics, will find considerable grain for their grist in the letters dealing with White's leadership of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, but the whole story is not here, for reasons of space. Within the book's limits, however, persons interested in parties, public opinion, and political personalities will find a great deal of useful material.

One of the more challenging aspects of White's personality, for the specialist in party politics, is the small-town editor's hero worship of Theodore Roosevelt. In the hierarchy of political leadership, which by its very nature is feudal in character, William Allen White was a loyal vassal of the Rough Rider. Only once in the pages of this collection does White talk back to his liege lord. In similar fashion, the political analyst will find a matter of great interest in the partisan loyalty which kept White from recognizing the full merits of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Though he professed in his *Autobiography* that his Republicanism was based more upon expediency and geography than upon principle or tradition, yet the habit of a generation, together with the scars of many political encounters, gave a partisan twist to his mind. Emotion also played a significant part in his dislike of the East. Indeed, he was a symbol of the Middle West, and his allegiance to his native region was an important factor in his retirement from leadership of the Committee to Defend America. In other words, the political psychologist will study White's *Letters* with great interest to see the invisible forces of personal, regional, and party emotion which determine the attitudes of an outstanding political figure.

The *Letters* shed a little new light upon the whole Progressive movement and will be studied closely by those who are inquiring today if Middle Western liberalism is dead. White was a master realist in appraising the political attitudes of farmers and small-town people. The volume merits

careful examination by all who are asking if World War II will be followed by a Harding era as was World War I. In 1936, White sized up Kansas politics acutely: "My opinion . . . is that if times get good, people vote Republican, and while times are bad, they are going to vote Democratic" (p. 356).

Finally, anyone who loves to read the masters of American prose will find many a gem from the facile pen of the skillful editor. The Kansan loved a good joke or spicy wit. Political scientists who enjoy witticisms will find numerous examples in this volume, including the one about the personnel of the State Department: "The State Department has just two breeds of horned cattle—full blooded sons-in-law and high-grade sons-of-bitches" (p. 439). White's advice to Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1937 was to beware of coming into "the prostate zone" (p. 384). All of these items will add interest to the announcement of a forthcoming biography from the scholarly pen of Mr. Johnson, who has done a very craftsmanlike job of editing the *Letters*.

JASPER B. SHANNON.

University of Kentucky.

Dinner at the White House. By LOUIS ADAMIC. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1946. Pp. 276. $2.50.)

By means of an invitation from Mrs. Roosevelt to dine at the White House, Louis Adamic has, through this book, sought to dramatize his opinions on world affairs, and to clarify what American foreign policy should be, based on those opinions.

The occasion for the invitation to dinner appeared to be an attempt to secure from President Roosevelt his view of Adamic's proposal in a former volume entitled *Two-Way Passage* that American citizens with European backgrounds (especially those from the loyal occupied states) should be selected and trained with a view to their leadership in reconstructing and restoring these unfortunate states. Winston Churchill appeared as a surprise guest for dinner, and was, at the time, reading Mr. Adamic's book.

The author has attempted the difficult art of character delineation. He sees Mr. Churchill through unfriendly eyes, as an uncompromising Tory, an unblushing imperialist, a high-priest of Anglo-Saxonism, and as following the interests of the British Empire at all times. The picture he draws of Mr. Churchill, from a personal standpoint, is far from an admirable one. Mr. Roosevelt is credited with great personal charm, unprecedented political leadership, high motives, and liberal outlook. In discussing Mr. Roosevelt's official and political conduct, Mr. Adamic's technique is to ask many "double-barreled" questions, with the answer in many cases apparently indicated by the manner and wording of the

question. The end-result is to portray Mr. Roosevelt as a man of destiny and of opportunity, who, however, for reasons which Mr. Adamic has tried to advance, has fallen short of the desired and ultimate goal. Mrs. Roosevelt, receiving less attention from the standpoint of analysis, comes out first in the author's appraisal, and is given much credit for liberal leadership on her account, and for her aid to and influence upon the President.

Mr. Adamic does well to call attention to the deficiencies of the United Nations; to the dangers of a selfish Anglo-Saxon entente; to the difficulty and importance of understanding Soviet foreign policy; to the devitalizing influence of reaction in domestic and international affairs; and to the rights and interests of the small restored states.

In other respects, Mr. Adamic has done himself, as author and scholar, a real disservice. He might have recognized such merit as Anglo-Saxonism possesses. He might have given full credit to the British-American war undertakings and efforts, which made it possible for the occupied states to live again. He could have understood the necessity of some relaxation by the United States of its foreign contributions, due to the demands of its domestic economy. It is his right to criticize American policy at the San Francisco Conference, our dealings with the U.S.S.R, and our attitude toward Tito of Jugoslavia. It would have been better had he also pointed out the delinquencies of other nations at San Francisco; the unreasonable attitudes of the Soviet Union and the obstinancy of Mr. Molotov; and the faults and inconsistencies as well as the virtues of the Tito régime. And he might have tried to square Russia's recent conduct in diplomacy with her Yalta and Potsdam commitments!

The last part of the book is most disappointing. "Abroad the U.S.A. is feared and hated." Mr. Truman and his advisers seem without cause, ideas worthy of the name, or policy. The "Trumans and Byrneses" must yield to leaders as different as "day is from night." Everything is wrong. Nothing is right. Now it can be told!

In such matters as national destiny and world policy, no one man or group can have his or its way, blueprint the future, or control national and world destiny. Many men and many minds make their separate contributions. In the past, authors have taken seriously to task the country which has given them opportunity and security, for not following their special programs and points of view. And, strangely enough, the country has survived.

CHARLES E. MARTIN.

University of Washington.

American Planning; Past-Present-Future. By CLEVELAND RODGERS. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1947. Pp. xiv, 290. $3.00.)

If evidence were required of the government-planning phobia so wide-

spread among the people of the United States, it could be found in substantial measure in this book. Indeed its author, who has been a member of the Planning Commission of New York City and the Queensborough Planning Commission, a vice-president of the American Society of Planning Officials, and the author of several books dealing with planning, is so aware of the delicacy of the situation that he borrows the personality of a young Air Force officer, hoping through his observations and reactions to disarm the hostility that might otherwise greet such a discussion. A political scientist may find himself wishing at times that Mr. Rodgers were free to speak directly.

In establishing a background for his current reflections, Mr. Rodger's aviator surveys the entire panorama of American history, discovering that Washington, Jefferson, and more recent national leaders owe their claim to fame to their records as planners. The broad definition of planning adopted may seem somewhat questionable, but it can hardly be doubted that the approach is an effective one. Though the author has served primarily with local planning authorities, his interest in this book is concentrated on the broader aspects of planning. He remarks in passing that "city planning in the United States is largely replanning, but the transformation of our cities will remain a hopeless task until ways are found to finance rebuilding of dwellings and other necessary improvements," adding that "this is a national problem."

Mr. Rodgers does not regard most of the peacetime planning efforts as too effective. In the case of the administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt, he comments: "However necessary and well intentioned, the improvising of the New Deal, and much of the planning, was unscientific and badly organized and administered." Yet he maintains that "the same President and Administration were responsible for the war planning, which was highly scientific, nonpartisan, and marvelously organized." Over-all master plans are more or less disposed of as foreign to the United States and more appropriate for totalitarian states.

Certain of the conclusions which are most pointed go beyond what would ordinarily be included in a discussion of planning. Moreover, they are frequently thrown in as *obiter dicta* without detailed explanation or comment, and hence lose much of their force despite their provocative character. Thus the aviator is of the opinion that "our federal form of government, despite its manifold advantages, leaves much to be desired." State sovereignty is viewed as a "serious obstacle to individual well-being on farms and in urban communities." "Most 'planning' by states represents efforts to secure competitive advantages over other states, or from the country as a whole."

HAROLD ZINK.

DePauw University.

The Life of Neville Chamberlain. By Keith Feiling. (London and New York: The Macmillan Company. 1946. Pp. ix, 475. $6.00.)

Shortly after the death of Neville Chamberlain, his family asked Professor Keith Feiling to prepare a biography from the private papers of the dead statesman. Not having known Chamberlain, Feiling worked almost exclusively from the voluminous diaries and family letters placed in his hands. Whenever possible, he lets Chamberlain speak for himself. The result is one of the most interesting biographies of the year. It is not definitive, of course, since much more material must be made available before anything final can be written. But it throws a flood of light upon Chamberlain as man, as political leader, and as the unsuccessful architect of peace.

By far the best feature of the book is the light it throws upon the character and personality of its subject. The keynote is integrity, a "literal never-failing integrity which . . . was seen in the exact correspondence between intimate thought and public deed." We see, too, the surprising breadth of the man's interests and reading, which included not merely Shakespeare, whom he quoted on great occasions, but also music, science, and above all the healing world of nature. It is well, too, that Chamberlain's strongly social outlook is stressed. Not only in local administration, where he was a great success, but also in the national arena, there was a Radical cast to his mind, natural in a son of Joseph Chamberlain, a sympathy with labor and a good record in social legislation. He was really daring and far-sighted in such fields as housing, a successful Health minister, and a good Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Many passages in the diaries and letters help to explain the steady rise of Chamberlain to the leadership of his party. He was tireless as an organizer, a sedulous student of political tides, and loyal both to his leader and his associates. As prime minister, these qualities expressed themselves in his careful preparation of cabinet business and his willingness to help ministers meet their responsibilities as departmental heads. After the passiveness of Baldwin, there must have been something refreshing to colleagues in his willingness to give a lead in all phases of government business. But he was unduly self-confident and too prone not merely to advise but also to manage everything. The connection of this defect with the conduct of foreign affairs from 1937 to 1939 is obvious. So, too, is another weakness (in a politician at least)—excessive loyalty to associates.

In the chapters on foreign policy, Professor Feiling seeks to destroy what he calls certain legends. He shows that Chamberlain was a loyal supporter of sanctions against Italy until their failure was evident. Nor has he any difficulty in absolving him from the charge of sympathy with the Nazi régime or of impeding the rearmament of England. In reality,

Chamberlain had a typically Victorian detestation for Nazi irrationality and brutishness; while he was urging the restoration of military strength upon reluctant colleagues as far back as 1934. Indeed, a keen sense of the importance of power for policy was one of the principal reasons why he went to such lengths to avoid war in 1938. Professor Feiling is least happy, perhaps, when he seeks to answer criticisms of Chamberlain's Russian policy. It is not enough to show that he did not "ignore" Moscow, or that he was free from the motivations of crude class interests. And he leaves us still wondering why a shrewd and sincere man clung so long to the belief that the expansionist lusts of Nazi Germany could be subdued by a policy of appeasement only doubtfully applicable even to the ordinary quarrels of ordinary states. But this is something that will long be debated by students. In the meantime, Professor Feiling has written a distinguished book, one which every student of politics will profit from reading.

THOMAS P. PEARDON.

Barnard College.

The Swiss and United States Federal Constitutional Systems; A Comparative Study. By MYRON LUEHRS TRIPP. (Paris: Librairie Sociale et Économique. 1940. Pp. 247.)

Comparing Swiss and American political institutions was a most fashionable exercise among political scientists a generation or so ago. Those were the days when the institutions of democracy were still suffused with an aura of idealism and some of the more romantic historians, both in this and other countries, were finding democracy's roots in the Swiss *landsgemeinde* or in that institution's alleged lineal ancestor, the Teutonic folkmote. To find that comparative exercise being repeated in these sterner and more sophisticated days when totalitarianism has rubbed at least the sheen off the democratic ideal is, to say the least, somewhat surprising. Some, perhaps, will find Dr. Tripp's emulation of Bryce, Lowell, Brooks, Vincent, and others a mere excursion among the cobwebs of political ideology, or, to change the figure, somewhat of an inventory of political furniture on which dust will soon begin to accumulate if it has not already done so. Others, despite the author's rather uninspired style, may be moved by a reading of the volume to experience a certain nostalgia for the days when the initiative and referendum were being offered as the cure-all for the ills of democratic society and federalism was still regarded as a constitutional principle and not as a principle of administrative devolution. And having been so moved, the volume may even give these readers a certain emotional reassurance about the future of democracy and its inherent vitality. Such a result is especially likely if the reader will bear in mind that the contents of the book were prepared as a dissertation by an obviously brilliant Ph. D. candidate who was born

when the first World War was ending, that this dissertation was accepted by a professor at the University of Zürich in the very heart of what was at the time "Hitler's Europe," and that it was subsequently printed in English and published at Paris in 1940 at the very time when the Maginot Line was being flanked.

The circumstances of its manufacture and publication will explain and excuse the book's many physical flaws, particularly the misspelled words which interlard the text on every page and the occasional structural imperfections of a more serious nature. There are other shortcomings for which the author must bear more direct responsibility. For one thing, despite the physical limitations of space, he has frequently fallen victim to the temptation to become encyclopaedic, an understandable weakness in an undertaking of this type, but productive of results not altogether salutary. One such result is the interspersion here and there in the text of a variety of trivia that ought better to have been reserved for the pages of a statistical almanac or some text-book or manual. Still another result is a serious abridgment of opportunity for adequate interpretative and analytical comment when such comment was necessary to the author's own reputation for impartial and discriminating judgment. Had he been less insistent upon covering ground, he might, for example, have provided a more balanced view of the American Supreme Court's exercise of the power of judicial review (p. 55); or he might have supplemented the quite inadequate statement on p. 222 that in both Switzerland and America "a law may abrogate a treaty."

These defects make the reader's task somewhat laborious, so much so that they may well dissipate that potential nostalgia to which reference was made earlier. Nevertheless, the specialist who persists will find much that is new and of value. The selection of basic reference works in the bibliographical appendix indicates that the author is quite as familiar with Swiss as with American constitutional jurisprudence and politics, and this familiarity is occasionally reflected in astute observations on the actual operation and administration of institutions common to the two countries. He has, moreover, rendered students a service by his comparative survey of the interbellum development of such institutions as emergency legislation, the ordinance powers of the executive, and other phenomena usually associated with so-called "crisis" government. Equally valuable are his comments on the centripetal influences currently being exerted on the federal structure of the two countries and his comments on the evolution of political parties. Attention should be called also to his first chapter on the ideological influences of American experience upon the various Swiss constitutions. Here he has unearthed a great deal of fugitive literature not normally available to the researcher, and the

result is the most authoritative work on the subject yet seen by this reviewer.

Undoubtedly as America develops her destined rôle as a world power in the twentieth century, and the diplomatic and military responsibilities incidental to such a rôle begin to manifest their effect upon her domestic institutions, the constitutional structure and political experiences of these two historic federal republics will begin to diverge rather sharply. But, as Dr. Tripp has made clear, even as late as 1939 there was still a surprising parallelism in the evolutionary paths of their respective systems of government.

ARNOLD J. ZURCHER.

New York University.

French Personalities and Problems. By D. W. BROGAN. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1947. Pp. x, 241. $3.00.)

This volume consists of twenty-seven incidental pieces on the subject of modern French life and culture. All of them, it seems—articles, book reviews, and reports—appeared elsewhere between the years 1935 and 1945, and they reappear here "exactly as they were first printed." Mr. Brogan is erudite, he reveals sharp insight, and his mode of expression is graceful. He writes delightfully of Dumas *père*, who preached "a morality to France, and a truth about France to foreigners, that has never been less out of date than in this iron age." He recalls M. Georges Duhamel's remark to the effect that prior to World War II France appeared to be abandoning not only the Maginot line, but the Descartes line as well, and adds that "she also appeared to be abandoning the lesser but important Dumas line, garrisoned by so many lively ghosts." Holding Dumas to be, not a creator, but an observer and reporter of genius, Mr. Brogan believes that "the spirit of d'Artagan and Planchet was bound to be reincarnated, at a much darker hour . . . "This essay on Dumas was written in1942; it stands first in the collection and serves to suggest the running thesis of all the essays, namely, the rebirth of a strong and glorious France out of the gold of brave tradition and the ashes of disaster.

Mr. Brogan writes of the strength and weakness of France, of the spirit of the French Revolution, of French nationalism, of Barrès, Marcel Proust, Maurras, Clemenceau, de Gaulle, and Darlan, to mention but a few of the subjects of these essays. In "The France We Need," he asserts that the France Europe wants "and Europe needs, is a France that has not renounced 1793 or 1789, that is prouder of having destroyed the Bastille than of having built it." He anticipates (this was in 1943) a time when Paris will become a "volcano of light" (Victor Hugo) for a free and united Europe, when France will be restored to Europe as "the chief

teacher of the amenities of life—and of the dignity of man." "Neither we nor any non-French power" he says, "can decide whether such a France is to come to life or not. But we can very easily make its birth difficult and dangerous. If we do, we shall not have to live very long to live to repent it."

Students of France will find much of value in these essays, particularly as English interpretations of modern French thought, movements, events, and personalities. Altogether there is a degree of comprehensiveness incorporating the larger aspects of French life—political, social, and psychological. However, some of the essays are dated, and some give the impression of having been produced with speed and under the tension of a mighty struggle. Though there is a connecting theme, there is a troublesome disjointedness and oftentimes a dissatisfying brevity. Excellent as it is, this work is not to be compared with Mr. Brogan's earlier *Government of the People* and *The Free State*.

Having left the texts as they were originally printed, there is, as Mr. Brogan notes, "inconsistency and repetition," but the alternative, he says, was "submission to the temptation to display hindsight." This reviewer sees no objection to the alternative, and Mr. Brogan would have been forgiven had he been tempted; for what is the writing of history, and much of this is history, but the everlasting display of hindsight, of evaluation and reëvaluation.

Mr. Brogan, to his credit be it said, offers these essays for what they are, and as such they are penetrating, earnest, and absorbing.

C. Gordon Post.

Vassar College.

French Labor; From Popular Front to Liberation. By Henry W. Ehrmann. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1947. Pp. xxi, 330. $4.00.)

It must be a rare student of political science who makes any study of French practical politics without feeling fascinated by observance of their deep-running currents and their deep-cut issues. French politics, not without reason, are commonly regarded as being exceedingly complex. So far as the period of the last dozen years or so is concerned, the disastrous defeat of France at the hands of the German armies has of course been a highly complicating factor. Among the large number of books and other writings concerning various aspects of French affairs in the period, Dr. Ehrmann's monograph is one of the exceptional few that seem to proceed from a sure and steady hand. Exceptions aside, the typical writings display little genuine apprehension of the nature of the political, social, and economic factors involved; or, where some effort is made to appraise these factors, the result leaves much to be desired because concern is

had for the fact of the French disaster rather than for its nature and extent. In all these respects, Dr. Ehrmann's book on organized labor in France is, it may be repeated, distinctly exceptional.

Dr. Ehrmann's treatment of the French labor union movement covers the momentous decade 1934-44. This decade he divides into three periods. The first, which begins a week after the February riots of 1934 with the general strike sponsored by the Reformist and the Communist national labor confederations (CGT and CGTU), ends with the outbreak of war in September, 1939. The highpoints in this period were, of course, the fusion of the two labor confederations, the victory of the Popular Front, the subsequent uncertainty centering around appeasement, and at the end the exclusion of the Communists from the united confederation. The second period covers the short time of the "phony war" and the shorter time of actual combat. There are made to stand out the character and the distressing results of the position of organized labor during these months, with the importance of the CGT diminished and its potential accomplishment limited by the break with the somersaulting Communists and by dissensions within the ranks of the remainder between the "classical" elements and the friends of *syndicats*. The third period extends from the armistice to the liberation, during which time, though certain leaders and elements of the CGT became collaborationist, the body of organized workers grew in numbers and in solidarity and through resistance achieved regeneration.

In connection with all three divisions of the decade studied by Dr. Ehrmann, the development of organized labor is treated with rare competence in terms of, or against the background of, all important considerations, including such things as the political and social situation, the legislation passed on labor and on kindred subjects, the relations between labor and management, and the position of the Catholic unions. The solid documentation of the volume is abundantly evident, note references, collected at the end, running to thirty closely packed pages. Of three appendices, one consists of the preamble to the Statutes of the CGT adopted by the Congress of Unification at Toulouse in March, 1936, a second contains the text of the Matignon Agreement, whereas the third gives certain statistics with respect to increase in membership from 1936 to 1937 of federations affiliated with the CGT. The author stresses the reluctance with which, because of the somewhat sparser sources, he writes of the Vichy period; but this is a case of scholarly caution and modesty. Throughout the volume, the knowledge is mature and sure. There is complete absence of bias in the bad sense of the word. At the same time, the treatment is far from colorless. The importance of the subject is assumed from the beginning; and an eminently fair account of accom-

plishments and of obstacles to accomplishment contains implied but definite judgments. Dr. Ehrmann has come close to writing a model monograph.

ROBERT K. GOOCH.

University of Virginia.

The Problem of War in Nineteenth Century Thought. BY EDMUND SILBERNER. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1946. Pp. xiv. 332. $3.00.)

This work, initiated under Professor Rappard at Geneva and completed under Professor Earle at the Institute of Advanced Studies at Princeton, is correctly described on the cover as "a sober consideration of the relationship between war and economics as reflected in the history of economic thought of the 19th century." To a reviewer who is not an economist, it seems to be a thorough job; it obviously meant much study of the writings of the various economists. The analysis is careful, and the presentation is clear. The translation into English is excellent. The study is divided into three books, dealing with the Classical School, the Protectionists, and the Socialists; and in a final chapter the author sums up the results of his investigations and concludes that war is too complex a matter to be solved by any one economist, certainly no one of them as yet having found the answer.

To the liberal economists, war was a phenomenon socially and economically harmful; it was not only immoral, but stupid. Malthus pointed out the relationship between the misery of the masses and war; James Mill regarded war as the cause of human misery. Free trade, this group argued, creates the ideal conditions necessary for peace, and was bound in the end to triumph. No international organization was needed, they thought; free trade was in itself a sufficient solution for war, provided economic knowledge was sufficiently diffused. The author regards this viewpoint as exaggerating the importance of the economic factor: free trade may help to diminish war, but war may even yet be profitable. He notes also the inconsistency that, according to these writers, the state is needed, but international organization is not; if free trade can make the latter unnecessary, why can it not also make the state unnecessary? (p. 284).

The protectionists, on the other hand, argued that war is a struggle to real advantages, and denied that war is always unprofitable. They regarded war as inevitable and asserted that it was foolish to disarm. Free trade, they said, is advantageous only to those having industrial strength, and protectionism, said List, is a means by which younger countries may strengthen their industrial production; it is indeed a form of war itself. The protectionists regarded the state, rather than the world, as the economic unit; protectionism worked for national consolidation and not for internationalism.

The socialist school regard war as anti-social, whether from a moral or an economic viewpoint, and beneficial only to a few privileged groups. They differ from the other two groups in regarding war as the consequence of a vicious social order, founded on the rotten basis of the institution of private property (p. 288). If this institution could be eliminated or brought under drastic control, there would be no need for war, or for an international organization to control war. The author regards this as "more than doubtful," since economic misery is not the only cause of war; but he credits the socialists with emphasizing the important point that the suppression of war depends upon the advance of economic justice.

The author thinks that peace can be secured only through federal union, but he suggests that the economists have brought out the following lessons which must be learned; (1) the more freedom of trade the better; (2) the weaker countries will not be content with industrial weakness, and their industrialization cannot be achieved outside world federation; and (3) international federation will fail unless it can advance economic security for individuals.

CLYDE EAGLETON.

New York University.

The Great Challenge. BY LOUIS FISCHER (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce. 1946. Pp. 346. $4.00.)

This book is partly a journalist's diary, partly an attempt to demonstrate with what monotonous regularity the author has been able to call the turn in world affairs, and partly a prescription for the world's ills. Mr Fischer is most successful in the first and least successful in the third.

He reports on his recent foreign travels and conversations with the great and the near great in the United States, Britain, and India. As usual, his reporting is vivid and discriminating. It deserves the attention of the political scientist who cannot himself go to the same countries or converse with the same men. There are no new conversations reported with leaders of the country Fischer knows best. He has paid the penalty which the journalist of integrity so often pays if he reports faithfully what he sees in a dictatorship. He is no longer welcome in the Soviet realm.

Whether it is because "Russia is caught in the contradictions of Socialism in one country (p. 207)" or because "the Revolution succumbed to the Tsarist past (p. 200)," the fact is clear to Fischer that Russia has gone imperialist. Fischer hates Russian imperialism and says so. He hates British imperialism, too, but is fair enough to point out that in India one meets everywhere men who have been in British jails, whereas in a dictatorship these men would either be dead or still in jail. So far, so good.

When Dr. Fischer tells us how to nurse our sick world back to health, the language he uses is more hortatory than helpful, more provocative

than penetrating. For example: "Every resentful Asiatic is a Russian asset against England and America, and the West generally. The West should abandon imperialism because it is evil, and bad for the moral and material interests of the West. But if the Western powers are too obtuse to understand that, then they will act under the impact of the great Russian challenge (p. 283)." "The great challenge of our time is to adjust the way we live to the way we could live if we took advantage of our mechanical and technical progress (p. 118)."

"The old game of power politics is immoral and leads to war (p. 146)." "If the liquidation of the British Empire had been the first foundation stone of peace, it would have been easier to stem Russian imperialism and to inhibit trends toward American imperialism (p. 167)." "If there were a federal government of the world there would be no war . . . Man's choice is world government by will power or world government by war power (p. 173)." "I oppose alliances and spheres of influence because they are neither moral nor practical (p. 178)."

"The key to peace in the atomic age is Big Three respect for small countries and independence for colonies (p. 181)." "The Big Three, however, permitted the numerous little ones nothing more than 'consultation' and 'discussion.' Among the Three, moreover, one could veto two. One, therefore, could dictate to the world. This is the ultimate in nationalism and the minimum in internationalism (p. 251)."

"It is desirable that the British grant independence to their colonies. With an effective United Nations to protect them, those colonies would gradually develop and cease to be objects of international rivalry (p. 282." "My own attitude is that England should liquidate the Empire, Russia should not acquire an empire, and America should not aspire to empire. Then war and threats of war would cease (p. 325)." Happy day!

WILLIAM T. R. FOX.

Yale Institute of International Studies.

The Finances of European Liberation. By FRANK A. SOUTHARD, JR. (New York: King's Crown Press. 1946. Pp. ix, 206. $3.00.)

Professor Southard's volume is a genuine contribution to an understanding of the use of military and other currencies in occupied and liberated European countries, and to an understanding of the many financial problems which exist in countries uprooted by war. The volume touches upon the main areas of finance: currency policy and procedure, public finance, private finance, foreign exchange, and inflation. The chapter devoted to military currency policy and procedure is the most informative in the book and throws much light on a subject that has been confusing even to students of finance. The types of military and other currencies employed by the Allies in occupied and liberated countries are described

clearly, as are the reasons for their use. Experience in the use of the various types of currencies and the problems that were encountered in the several countries are related, and a critical evaluation is made. Southard concludes that, "taking it as a whole, Allied currency policy in Europe was adequate in conception and properly executed. It conformed to accepted international law. It was designed to respect the policies and wishes of the governments in liberated areas, and to bear as lightly on financial structures of liberated and conquered countries alike as was consistent with the prosecution of the war. The primary purpose was achieved: to supply the Allied forces with funds and to assure an adequate circulating medium in the countries in which they operated." The author nevertheless indicates several points of weakness in the currency policy which, if they had been avoided, would have left fewer problems for the future.

The other financial problems dealt with are familiar to students of finance. The financial consequences of public and private expenditures at peak levels, of acute shortages of commodities, and of severe dislocations in economic systems, are evident in every war period. Southard traces the events, describes the problems, and indicates the consequences of the financial dislocations, excesses, and breakdowns. His discussion has the merit of being based on much first-hand observation and information.

Southard is acutely aware of the financial and economic problems which beset war-torn Europe. He knows that heroic measures will have to be taken to restore even a semblance of stability. And in the accomplishment of stability the rôle of government will have to be great. While the Fascist system in Italy, for example, has been destroyed, the highly centralized machinery for economic and social control which the Fascists erected cannot be abandoned. "The Italian economy has traveled a long road since the March on Rome, and to turn back toward lightly regulated competition would be difficult under conditions of plenty, and is probably impossible under the conditions that exist. The Italian government must find ways to mobilize capital, to finance imports, to allocate acutely-scarce materials and equipment, to determine what industries need first to be rehabilitated, and so on. There is virtually no prospect that private enterprise, weakened by twenty years of Fascism, can do so. Whether at some point in the process of recovery and stabilization, state control will begin giving way to private, remains to be seen. It is the author's opinion that the Italy of tomorrow, like that of yesterday, will have a state-dominated economy."

In the opinion of this reviewer, it does not require great acumen to realize that state control such as Southard envisages not only will be continued in Italy, but will be extended to many, if not all, of the European economies.

NATHAN L. SILVERSTEIN.

Indiana University.

The United States and the Near East. By Ephraim A. Speiser. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1947. Pp. xvi, 263. $2.50.)

Dr. Speiser's book is careful, thoughtful, and timely. Perhaps not everyone will agree that the Near East is "the global center of gravity" (p. 236) or that history and geography "have ordained the region to be the main proving ground of the new world order" (p. 167); but none can deny that it is "the scene of converging—and often conflicting—interests of all the major powers of today" (p. 18).

Notice must be taken of the author's unusually narrow application of the term "Near East." He includes only Egypt and the lands in Asia where Arabic is the prevailing language: Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Transjordan, Iraq, and lesser areas in Arabia. Again, only the last eighteen pages of text are precisely on the subject of the book: the relations between the United States and the Arab Near East.

Within these limitations, the book is valuable from beginning to end. The first half, including a discussion of the geography of the area, its cultural background, and an outline of its history to date, is admirable for its selection, organization, and clear direct presentation of pertinent facts. The second half, "problems of the present and the future," is not so close-trimmed and compact, but it also shows excellent organization and effective climacteric treatment. The whole book is a frank, honest exposition of events and conditions, with refreshing freedom from propagandist special pleading.

Since most of the general histories used by the English-speaking public for school and private reading practically omit the Arab East after the first century of the Muslim conquests, Dr. Speiser's book can clarify almost everybody's understanding of some very acute present-day problems. It might well be read most carefully by the current crop of statemen before they go further with delicate negotiations that can involve serious blunders. Questions concerning specifically Greece, Turkey, and Iran are indeed excluded by the plan of the book, but other disturbing subjects, such as the future of Palestine, the destination of Near Eastern oil, the use of the Suez Canal, the routes of long-distance airlines, and the means of constructing "a democratic, prosperous, and independent Near East" (p. 227) receive helpful consideration.

Dr. Speiser's vision of the future Arab East differs importantly from that now seen in Washington. He says that "automatic American support of British policy in the region tends to increase tension to the explosive point" (p. 231). Regretting that the number of Great Powers with stakes in the Arab East has been reduced, he believes earnestly in a balance of fully independent power among the three that remain: "three or four evenly balanced rivals meeting on common ground have among them all the elements that make for a society which must coöperate in order to survive" (p. 167).

Those who, like the reviewer, retain hopes for permanent peace, not through balancing of forces, but through coöperative efforts, cannot but be distressed at Dr. Speiser's certainty that the United Nations is not now nor can be soon "an effective international body" (p. 218). He is probably right in believing that only such a body can solve the problem of Palestine, but why not also the problems of the freedom of Greece and the security of the Dardanelles, the Suez Canal, and Gibraltar? Why cannot the United Nations supervise the use of Near Eastern petroleum in a way that is fair and salutary not only for the peoples in whose lands it is found, but also for the peoples of America, Britain, Russia, France, and the other countries of the earth? Until now, the "balance of power" has regularly led to general war. Also for some four hundred years Britain has taken, in such a war, the side that was at the outset weaker. Was not the United Nations created to supersede, among other dangerous doctrines, that of the "balance of power?"

The author's discussion of "personnel" (pp. 232–235) is decidedly apropos, but remains incomplete. Referring to the "insolvency of our present policy" in the Arab East, Dr. Speiser argues convincingly for the training of a considerable number of able specialists in the area, who will not be transferred over the world in random fashion. Such persons, he believes, cannot be trained in private institutions, nor in schools "sponsored by commercial interests, missionary interests, nor the present interests of the State Department" (p. 234). But he leaves the reader no more positive guide to the location and plan of such effective training than a feeling of certainty that this work is being done intensively by Britain and Russia.

The book has good maps showing the general terrain (end papers), proposals for the partition of Palestine, and oil concessions; it has also intelligent suggestions for reading and an adequate index.

ALBERT HOWE LYBYER.

University of Illinois.

China. EDITED BY HARLEY FARNSWORTH MCNAIR. (Berkeley, California: University of California Press. 1946. Pp. xxxv, 573. $6.50.)

This symposium, the fifth volume in the United Nations Series under the general editorship of Professor Robert J. Kerner, is a matter for congratulation to all concerned: to the editors, both general and special; to the contributing authors; to the directors of the University of California Press; and, last but not least, to those of the reading public—may their number be great—who take full advantage of its many-sided approach to the history and culture of the Chinese people.

The thirty-four chapters of the book, contributed by thirty-two writers, are organized into a well-integrated pattern. Part One—"Backgrounds"—consists of three chapters: "Molding Forces," "Dominant Ideas," and "Some Revelations of Recent Excavations." The nine chapters of Part

Two—"Historical and Political Development"—take up, in order: "Antiquity: To the Fall of Shang," "The Greatness of Chou," "From the Fall of Chou to the Fall of T'ang," "From the Fall of T'ang to the Fall of Ch'ing," "Chinese Society and the Dynasties of Conquest," "The Republic: Phase of War-Lordism," "The Republic: Phase of Resurgence," "The Social Revolution," and "International Relations: The Twentieth Century." Part Three—"Philosophy and Religion"—covers these aspects of China's cultural history in eight chapters: "Chinese Thought," "Folk Religion," "Confucianism," "Neo-Confucianism," "Taoism," "Buddhism," "Christianity," and "Trends in Contemporary Philosophy." Part Four—"The Arts, Literature, and Education"—has ten chapters dealing with: "Calligraphy, Poetry, and Painting," "Art," Architecture," "Drama," "Traditional Literature: Nature and Limitations," "Letters and Arts in the War Years," "China: A Frontier in American Literature," "Modern Education," and "China's Examination System and the West." The three chapters of Part Five—"Economics and Reconstruction"—treat of "Economic Development," "Agriculture," and "International Trade." Part Six—"Retrospect and Prospect"—closes the study with a single chapter on "China Among the Nations."

As could reasonably be expected, the contributions are marked by wide diversity in style and treatment. Some of the historical chapters, e.g., those by Professor Goodrich on "Antiquity" and by Professor Wittfogel on the "Dynasties of Conquest"—are broadly interpretative, while others—such as Professor Teng's "From the Fall of Chou to the Fall of T'ang" or the editor's own treatment of "The Period of War-Lordism"—are almost too factual for easy reading. Three of the Chinese contributors—Dr. Hu Shih, Professor Teng, and Mr. Chiang Yee—differ sharply among themselves in their evaluation of Buddhism and its influence upon China's cultural growth. Professor Linebarger, writing on "The Republic (1928–1946)," and Miss Smedley, in her chapter on "Social Revolution," cover substantially the same ground, but with divergencies in interpretation that may easily bring utter bewilderment to a reader who is seeking for "authoritative" truth.

To the serious student of China and things Chinese, however, these divergencies and differences will be of positive value. "China" is a civilization to be viewed from many angles and weighed in many balances, not a subject that can be wrapped up in a neat little package or a problem to be solved according to a carefully drawn blue-print. For those to whom this volume opens up a new appreciation of Chinese history and Chinese civilization, a Selected Bibliography of some four hundred titles—prepared by "Chan Wing-tsit and others"—offers almost unlimited opportunity for, and temptation to, additional serious study.

G. NYE STEIGER.

Simmons College.

The Chrysanthemum and the Sword. By Ruth Benedict. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1946. Pp. 324. $3.00.)

In June, 1944, when the United States faced the early prospect of the invasion of Japan, and when it had become imperative that we understand the enemy's behavior in order to devise means of dealing with it, Ruth Benedict was called upon to use all the techniques of the cultural anthropologist in an effort to comprehend Japanese habits of thought and emotion and the patterns into which these habits fell. As a war assignment, the task was the more difficult because of the pressure of time and because "there were violent disagreements among those [in America] who knew the Japanese best." What began, however, as a war assignment, now appears as an even more vital addition to our literature on the peace.

Fundamental in the suggestions that emerge from this study is the concept that the building of a durable peace between East and West is not a matter of what the West, represented by the United States, has the power to impose on the defeated enemy. "If what Americans want is, as they say, a self-respecting Japan, they will have to recognize her bases for self-respect" (p. 150). Easy solutions are thus out of the question; for, as Mrs. Benedict so ably demonstrates, Japanese historic bases of self-respect are not ours, yet they are as valid to the Japanese as ours are to us. To cite merely one example of many, it is especially important for Occidentals to recognize "that the 'circles' into which the Japanese divide life do not include any 'circle of evil.' This is not to say that the Japanese do not recognize bad behavior, but they do not see human life as a stage on which forces of good contend with forces of evil" (p. 197).

It will perhaps be equally difficult for Americans to understand the Japanese point of view that virtue does not consist in fighting evil. Japan has no theology which teaches the doctrine of the "Fall of Man." Her ethical code, which requires "extreme repayment of obligations" and many "drastic renunciations," nevertheless does not condemn self-gratification through the senses so long as these gratifications are kept within proper limits. Indeed, the Japanese have cultivated "the pleasures of the flesh like fine arts, and then, when they are fully savored, they sacrifice them to duty" (p. 178). Contrary to what Americans have often inferred, this is not a code of self-indulgence and license. And in this respect it should be noted that in Japanese eyes the American ideal of the pursuit of happiness is "an amazing and immoral doctrine. Happiness is a relaxation in which one indulges when one can, but to dignify it as something by which the state and family should be judged is quite unthinkable" (p. 192).

In general, Mrs. Benedict has high praise for the American administration of Japan since VJ-Day. In the Japanese scheme of things, she finds that a policy of good faith was likely to pay off well, since "in Japanese eyes it removed from the stark fact of defeat the symbols of humiliation and challenged them to put into effect a new national policy, acceptance of

which was possible precisely because of the culturally conditioned character of the Japanese" (p. 299).

Democracy, Mrs. Benedict finds, is possible of achievement since the Japanese have an ethic of alternatives. Their training has conditioned them to accept changes of direction. But she warns that we must expect them to modify the methods upon which we rely to achieve democracy. If militarism is a lost cause, the Japanese will forsake it. They have the saying: "It is no use biting one's navel." Against this Japanese capacity "to change direction," it is well to remember that "when the Japanese believe themselves humiliated, revenge is a virtue" (p. 307).

The Chrysanthemum and the Sword is a study of the utmost importance and a testimonial to the scholarship and literary skill of the author.

PAUL H. CLYDE.

Duke University.

Japan, Past and Present. By EDWIN O. REISCHAUER. Foreword by Sir George Sansom. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1946. Pp. x, 192, xiv.)

Here in the brief compass of slightly less than two hundred pages, or about sixty thousand words, is an excellent, well balanced, readable summary of Japanese history. It is by an expert who is familiar with the sources and the secondary works, and so brings together what is known of the past of Japan. It is for the novice rather than the specialist. It presents few new views or novel interpretations, but rehearses in competent, sober fashion what is already familiar to those acquainted with the land. It reduces Japanese proper names to a minimum, yet without omitting the most important. It thus at once avoids bewildering the amateur with a multiplicity of strange terms and gives him those which are really significant. Approximately three-fifths of the space is devoted to the long span of the centuries before the coming of Perry, and about two-fifths to the slightly less than a century since that event. The main emphasis is upon political developments, but attention is paid to other phases of culture. Excellent maps uncomplicated by superfluous names and physical features, supplement the text. For a brief, introductory survey of Japanese history, either for the somewhat hypothetical general reader or for brief courses in high school or college, Dr. Reischauer's book is unexcelled.

It is a rare book in which the reviewer cannot find something of which to complain, either in fact or in emphasis. Thus (p. 90), the statement that after the revolt of 1637–38 "Christianity ceased to exist as an organized religion in Japan" is misleading. Christianity no longer had a priesthood, but Christian villages persisted, somewhat surreptitiously, each normally organized around two leaders, until with the reopening of Japan in the nineteenth century they once more came to light. The part of Theodore Roosevelt in the Treaty of Portsmouth seems somewhat exaggerated

(p. 139) in an allusion to "the peace arranged in 1905 by President Theodore Roosevelt." In a book which will be read chiefly by Americans, one could wish that more attention had been paid to relations between the United States and Japan, especially the long-standing friction which led to Pearl Harbor and the steps by which the United States now finds herself the dominant power in Japan. Moreover, the optimism concerning the future of Japan which characterizes the last chapter is encouraging, but seems scarcely to take account of the many grave problems which confront the nation.

A commendable feature is the lack of rancor against the Japanese. Coming so soon after the War, the book might well have been strongly anti-Japanese. It does, indeed, point out the main stages by which the extremists led Japan to war, but in general it is objective and is even sympathetic with the rank and file of the Japanese.

KENNETH S. LATOURETTE.

Yale University.

The Conqueror Comes to Tea. BY JOHN LACERDA. (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press. 1946. Pp. 224. $2.75.)

Within the next few years, books concerning the occupation of Japan and of Germany will be appearing on the market. The soldiers, experts, and correspondents will have their say. One of the first to appear, covering Japanese occupation, is John LaCerda's *The Conqueror Comes to Tea.*

Through some 224 pages, Mr. LaCerda explores Japan under occupation in hit-and-miss style, passing from the war trials ("They Call Us Cheats") to the amorous behavior of occupying personnel (Love Without Kisses"). This is a written account of the inquiries and impressions of a correspondent somewhat familiar with the Japanese scene—an account which benefits from the inquiring method which is the newspaper man's advantage.

But this report is reminiscent of partially-documented "bull sessions," the like of which can be heard, though not read, in any of a number of officers' clubs throughout Japan. General discussions may be interesting, but they are not always accurate. This is true of Mr. LaCerda's book.

For example, on p. 46 ff, the "knotty problems of the occupation" are exemplified by "the case of the one-time Kempei Tai sergeant." The story explains that "the Kempei Tai sergeant" occupied the position of chief liaison man between the army and the Japanese. "Things were confused; orders weren't carried out . . . One time Kempei was hauled away to jail. Conditions immediately improved." The only trouble with this example is that it is untrue. (The reviewer was a military government officer at the prefectural capital where the event took place.) The chief of the Liaison Section (Japanese) was not a former sergeant in the Kempei Tai; he was not "hauled away to jail"; he still holds an important position

in the Nagano prefectural administration. It is true that there was misunderstanding and confusion under this liaison chief's direction, but both the cause and the effect of the confusion require more careful analysis than has been presented by Mr. LaCerda, especially considering the falsification of the facts resulting from the acceptance of "facts" from a source which, in this instance, was uninformed.

The occupation of Japan is a serious and important duty of the Allies—one founded upon the idea that a defeated nation may be molded into the forms necessary to enable it to take a place in the family of nations. Books such as *The Conqueror Comes to Tea* fail to dig at the roots of the job to be accomplished.

Read as a fact-and-fiction commentary on Japan, 1946, the book has some interest-value. But the reading public deserves more than a surface scanning of the Japanese occupation. A balanced and factual account may be produced in the future; Mr. LaCerda's attempt does not qualify.

RICHARD L. PARK.

Harvard University.

The Social Effects of Aviation. By WILLIAM FIELDING OGBURN. (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1946. Pp. vi, 755. $5.00.)

Will airplanes become as numerous as automobiles? Professor Ogburn does not think so. But readers of his new book who are also owners of railway and steamship-line securities will conclude that they probably possess a depreciating asset because of the inroads on the long-distance passenger traffic of these earlier public carriers which air lines are likely to make.

It satisfies logic that Professor Ogburn, who gave us the helpful concept of "cultural lag," should write this book, a pioneering and notable work. It is inspired by the theory that "since there is a time sequence between an invention and its social effects, we should, knowing the invention, be able to anticipate consequent changes." It is an effort to chart the modifications that a fuller development of aviation will introduce into the organization and peacetime way of life of our society. Having undertaken the experiment, Professor Ogburn invites all social scientists to try applying their skill, statistical method, and common sense to the anticipatory evaluation of the institutional adjustments that may occur because of technological advances in other fields, to the end that more effective planning may be undertaken.

Professor Ogburn's new work is really a report prepared at the request of United Air Lines. As such, it marks a trend, in which the University of Chicago has been outstanding, whereby the know-how of the social scientist is applied to research on problems of industrial, financial, and commercial enterprise, and the findings published for all to read.

Professor Ogburn is modest concerning the present possibilities of prediction as to the social consequences of technological change. His report presents an extraordinarily imaginative and inclusive analysis of possible consequences resulting from our newest form of transportation. He is, however, shrewdly cautious in his statements. He seldom attempts exact estimates or precise prognostications, pointing out repeatedly that the "possibilities" and "probabilities" will depend on such interrelated imponderables as pricing, profit, public policy, and consumer-acceptance. Whether dealing with the possible or the probable, Professor Ogburn tends to limit himself to the period of the first and second postwar decades.

The longest section of the book—over four hundred pages—comprises an encyclopedic catalogue of these possible social effects of aviation. In successive chapters, the author inquires into the possible effects on population, the family, cities, religion, health, recreation, crime, education, railroads, ocean shipping, manufacturing, marketing, mining, real estate, newspapers, agriculture, forestry, stock-raising, government, public administration, international relations, and international policies. In connection with each of these topics he presents an amazing variety of data and summarizes an extensive bibliography. In fact, the ambitious scope of the book leads to an elaborate subdivision of subjects within each chapter, with the result that many of the sub-subjects are treated in no more than a brief paragraph. Because of this desire to be inclusive, and because of the interrelationships between the topics, there is considerable repetition. But the presentation is always lucid and of interest to the general reader, even when dealing with technical matters.

Professor Ogburn does not try to evaluate the rôle of aviation in future wars, because "there is so much secrecy in this field, and the technological changes are so rapid and revolutionary, that the author could not make a satisfactory study." Internationalists will disappointedly thumb the volume for assurance that the development of aviation will speed us toward an era of universal love and brotherhood of man. But no such consolation will be found. Rather, Professor Ogburn anticipates that air transport will heighten nationalism, especially in states "with much illiteracy and poor roads," and will promote what he sees as the trend toward large regional organization.

RAYMOND G. MCKELVEY.

Occidental College.

BRIEFER NOTICES

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Vice-Admiral Ross T. McIntire (in collaboration with George Creel), in his *White House Physician* (G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1947, pp. 244, $3.00),

writes as physician and devoted friend of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and he tells his story because "it would be nothing short of tragedy if Roosevelt the president pushed Roosevelt the *man* out of mind and memory" (p. 10). The President's physician experienced little difficulty in keeping him fit until the war years. The Admiral reports that in the pre-convention days of 1944 he and his consultants found the President organically sound. But, considering the terrific strain the President had been under for years, his doctor watched his heart as a possible source of trouble. Roosevelt's heart never failed. Nor did he, even during his last days, have extremely high blood pressure or advanced general arteriosclerosis, conditions from which cerebral hemorrhage, of which he died, might have been predicted. The Admiral thus, and not without spirit, answers the charge that the President was a "sick man." Admiral McIntire writes of Roosevelt's humor, his human sympathy, his charm (which failed on King Ibn-Saud), his hobbies, and his vision. The White House physician was naturally often on the "inside" of a great deal that went on. He tells, for example, of how nearly the President came to refusing to run in 1940. Immediately following his nomination by the Chicago convention, Roosevelt was furious over the "phony draft" criticism and the reaction to his insistence that Henry A. Wallace be named as his running-mate. Judge Samuel Rosenman, the doctor, and other White House intimates gaped helplessly as he scribbled on a sheet of paper. He threw down his pencil and handed the sheet to Judge Rosenman. "'Put that in shape, Sam' he ordered, 'and give it out. No,' he continued, turning to us, 'I've made up my mind.... I'm through. Go on, Sam, and do as I've told you'" (p. 125). The Judge left the room with the paper, but General Edwin ["Pa"] Watson followed him and jerked it from his hand. The members of the inner circle then found their voices and within an hour the President "smiled somewhat sheepishly and admitted that he had gone off half-cocked" (p. 126).—CLAUDIUS O. JOHNSON.

Surprise awaits the reader who encounters *The Future of American Secret Intelligence* (Infantry Journal Press, 1946, pp ix, 120, $2.00), by George S. Pettee. Sensationalism is anticipated; curtains presumably are to be lifted and mysteries disclosed. Instead, the reader encounters a realistic analysis of the problem of intelligence service on all levels as a phase of future governmental activity and concern. It seems to the reviewer that fresh ground is broken by this little book. The political scientist has in the main not appreciated the exigencies of the military—nay more, has too frequently either disdained them or reprehended them. Hence the impact of Pettee's book is accentuated by the admission of the past sins of the political and social scientist. The book under review is

broken into seven chapters, dealing with the following subjects: the faults and errors of strategic intelligence in the war; war and strategic intelligence; strategic intelligence and peace; impediments to good organization; the management of intelligence; professional doctrine; the place of strategic intelligence in the government. This should suffice to indicate the scope of subject-matter treated by the author. The presentation is direct, simple, and clear. The style is unadorned, yet lucid, and the interest never flags. As an elementary statement of the problem of intelligence within the panoply of governmental functions, this represents an adequate, competent, introduction. That it is elementary is conceded; for a better, larger book could be reared upon its framework. To many readers, the most interesting aspect of the volume will be its analysis of the past record and future rôle of the social scientist in the process of intelligence. It is to be hoped that Professor Pettee's interest in the problem will not cease with this slight dip in the swimming hole.—CHARLES W. SHULL.

Glyndon G. Van Deusen's *Thurlow Weed: Wizard of the Lobby* (Little, Brown and Co., 1947, pp. 403, $4.00) is not only the biography of a man, but a political history of the more than forty-year period (particularly 1830–70) in which Weed participated actively in state and national affairs. It portrays the rise of a boss to political power and financial wealth on lines characteristic of nineteenth-century America. Weed is thus closely linked with political intrigue in the manipulation behind the scenes of party decisions. He exerted tremendous influence upon the rise of the Whig party in the 1830's, in opposing Henry Clay for the presidency in 1840, and in supporting Zachary Taylor in 1848. One of the most colorful sections of the biography deals with the Republican convention of 1860, in which Weed almost made William H. Seward President instead of Lincoln. There are interesting character studies of prominent political and business figures of the day. While there was no break in the long personal and political alliance with Seward, Weed was always alert to block the political advancement of Horace Greeley. Weed "hobnobbed with bank presidents and railroad presidents and solid, wealthy merchants, with speculators and lobbyists and short-arm boys." He not only influenced the course of legislation for compensation (the first to practice lobbying on a "scientific" basis), but was "quick to seize upon many of the opportunities for profit that the [Civil] War presented. Even as he strove to aid the cause of the Union, he was seeking to make a fortune." To the author, Weed was a keen observer of the issues of the times, who, however, "consistently underestimated the moral fervor that derived from making a crusade against slavery an avowed objective of the War." The reviewer notes with interest that, as journalist, Weed in 1846 recommended lower-

ing the voting age in New York to eighteen. The author succeeds in telling Weed's story with a high degree of fairness and impartiality.—BELLE ZELLER.

In her fifth study of "The Legislative Process in Alabama," Professor Hallie Farmer has investigated *Legislative Costs* (Bureau of Public Administration, University of Alabama, 1947, pp. 25). Chiefly for the period 1940–46, the costs assessed are, first, per diem and mileage payments to legislators; second, direct payments for legislative help; and third, incidental expenses such as stenographic service, printing, wire communication, and postage. This project is significant from two viewpoints. It makes known data about costs. This is the kind of detailed work which has to be done on a constantly wider scale in order to supply the facts basic to an understanding of American institutional life. Dr. Farmer makes clear that finding the costs was not always possible in the present case, partly because of inadequate records, and partly because expenditures were frequently not segregated as to their objects; and it becomes evident also that certain costs were difficult to determine because legislators wanted to make expenditures which were forbidden by the state constitution. The study is significant also because of the light which it throws on political behavior. The constitution, during a major part of the period, provided for a four-dollar-per-diem and a ten-cent-per-mile travel allowance. From time to time, various ways were found for paying more than four dollars for each day the legislators attended sessions and one mileage payment to and from their homes for each session. Many mileage payments were made for each session; the constitutional fifty-legislative-day session was extended up to 137 days by meeting a day or two and then recessing for committee work. Payments were made for work on recess committees. The most novel method of circumventing the constitution was the appropriation of a fund to an official of each house for "special expenses," from which each member received payments. The facts of legislative costs are valuable because without them one little corner of the picture would be distorted; but the facts of political behavior which appear in unexpected places add zest to the labors of the researcher and help bring the panorama of society into focus. —JOHN E. STONER.

In *Legislative Procedure in Kansas* (University of Kansas Publications, Governmental Research Series, No. 1, revised, pp. 80, free), Frederic H. Guild and Clyde F. Snider have provided an extremely useful monograph for the average citizen as well as for the expert in legislation. Here one finds a detailed description of the law-making process as actually followed in Kansas. In the first eighteen chapters, the involved pattern of law-making is examined. The remaining fifteen chapters cover related

topics, such as journal and calendar; order of business in each house; resolutions; and constitutional amendments. The final section explains available legislative aids. These seven pages show the rôle of the legislative council, the commission on interstate coöperation, the governor, and the administrative agencies in the preparation of legislative programs. The agencies which provide aid to committees and individual members are also listed. Much important data are contained in 309 footnotes. This results in a clear, smoothly written text, not burdened with unnecessary details. Fifteen figures give specific illustrations of various documents, such as a repealing act; a report of a senate committee; a report of committee of the whole house; and a veto message. Even without an index, the expanded table of contents makes the bulletin useful as a reference book. "Offered to the citizens of the state of Kansas as a further contribution of the Bureau of Governmental Research to a clearer understanding of our governmental institutions" (E. P. Allen's introduction), the bulletin should be widely available elsewhere as a basis for comparison and contrast whenever questions arise in connection with legislative organization and procedure in other states.—MONA FLETCHER.

The Utilization of Tax Resources by State Government in Utah (Institute of Government, University of Utah, 1946, mimeo, pp. 80), by G. Homer Durham, is a report to the legislature's tax study committee of 1945–47. This committee had been charged with (1) determination of the necessary expenses of state government, and what if any, current expenditures should be reduced or eliminated, (2) the study of constitutional provisions controlling revenues, and (3) recommendations for changes in those constitutional and legislative provisions which concern finance. On the matter of governmental expenditures and their curtailment, this study analyzes in some detail the expenditures of government by areas of services in Utah since the reorganization in 1941. About the only recommendation for a substantial reduction in expenditures was made for the item "other expenditures" in the governor's office, which includes expenses for defense programs no longer needed. A study of the constitutional provisions on appropriations and control of revenue led the author to conclude that basic constitutional changes should be accompanied by legislative reorganization which was long overdue. Only a new model legislature could exercise the meticulous care necessary to produce good legislation and the proper control and supervision over recently reorganized executive and judicial departments. Constitutional or statutory legislative reorganization, whichever it might be, should include reform in legislative procedure, the establishment of a legislative council, and an effective legislative reference service. Major recommendations for change in constitutional and legislative provisions relating to finance include those designed (1) to clarify

the fiscal work of the board of review, an *ex-officio* board composed of the governor, secretary of state, and attorney-general, and the newly created finance department (1941) which was vested with powers to enforce the appropriations act, to maintain legal financial service, and to strengthen the independent audit; (2) to provide an independent audit; and (3) to introduce an effectively organized budget office.—WILLIAM G. COMBS.

Another useful contribution to the field of model laws has been made by the National Municipal League in its *Model Accrual Budget Law* (Committee on a Program of Model Fiscal Legislation for Local Governments, pp. xx, 20, $0.50). The law is unequivocal in its objective of effecting financial stability through "unwatered" revenue estimates and stringent expenditure control. Interesting features include acceptance of the budget by the governing body in lieu of tax and appropriation ordinances; a five-year capital improvement program; planning commission recommendation on budget year capital improvements; and a "down payment on capital improvements." Differences of opinion and the need for local adaptation are recognized by the League. It would seem that too little time is allowed for legislative consideration; the record of two, rather than but one, complete previous fiscal years is desirable; some limit on the amount of administrative transfer would be conducive to more accurate departmental estimates; and it is illogical to treat delinquencies, abatements, etc., as expenditures rather than as revenue failures. The model law neglects to mention, but does imply, other requisites of good budget procedure and sound organization, integrated financial and personnel control, and adequate reporting. The minor criticisms advanced detract in no wise from the value of the model law in presenting to state and local groups a guide to the best thought on the subject of local accrual budgeting.—DONOVAN F. EMCH.

Since 1940, the University of Tennessee has held six Southern Institutes of Local Government. The *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Southern Institute of Local Government* (Bureau of Public Administration, University of Tennessee, 1947, pp. 68) is devoted to the problem of constitutional revision, with special reference to Tennessee. Included in the *Proceedings* are papers by M. H. Satterfield of TVA, Dean W. H. Wicker of the University of Tennessee College of Law, and Morton L. Wallerstein of the League of Virginia Municipalities. The papers of Dean William L. Bradshaw of the University of Missouri School of Business and Public Administration and Charlton F. Chute of the St. Louis Governmental Research Institute contribute the main interest for persons outside of Tennessee. The recent Missouri experience contains many lessons for other states. The observations of these two competent analysts are "must" reading for those interested in state constitutional revision.—JOSEPH M. RAY.

Clarifying some of the confusion that enshrouds the conception that gigantic corporations can be regulated, *The Structure of Transcontinental Railroad Rates* (University of California Press, pp. 165, $4.00) is a misnomer. Stuart Daggett and John P. Carter make no attempt to tackle passenger rates. Their treatment of freight rates, moreover, suffers certain limitations: rates to and from Oregon and Washington are lightly dismissed; those for the "unproductive mountain states" are inadequately analyzed; and the major emphasis is on rates to and from San Francisco, less than half the size of, and growing less rapidly than, Los Angeles. Including 35 tables, 21 charts, and 31 maps, the monograph's claim to academic importance rests on the fact that, freight schedules being so complicated, the railroad agents make numerous errors. Large shippers must, therefore, employ rate experts, now studying "utility regulation." Ruling grades, topographical obstacles, and other technical data pertaining to rate bases are discussed adequately for that purpose; and competition with highway and water carriers is presented as the paramount factor in making tariff schedules, where rates are higher for short hauls than for long hauls over the same line and in the same direction. Nothing in the monograph could displease the utility gentlemen serving on the Board of Regents.—ARTHUR D. ANGEL.

FOREIGN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Post-War Governments of Europe (published by the *Journal of Politics*, distributed by Kallman Publishing Co., Gainesville, Fla., 1946, pp. 164, $1.00), edited by David Fellman, is a reprint from the *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 8, No. 3, and comprises a series of articles on the postwar governments of Europe, most of them delivered as papers at a 1946 meeting of the American Political Science Association, some of them added in order to round out the subject-matter. The contributors are John N. Hazard (Russia), Eugene P. Chase (England), Charles A. Micaud (France), Karl R. Bopp (National Banks of England and France), Max Ascoli (Italy), Harold Zink (American Military Government in Germany), Paul R. Sweet (Austria), and Eric C. Bellquist (Scandinavian countries). A collection of this kind inevitably is handicapped by the fact that every author treats his particular subject in his personal manner, and that the various outlooks do not always dovetail. The merit of the collection will have to be found in the quality of the single articles rather than in an integrated view of the postwar constitutional problems of Europe. Agreeably enough, however, the present collection is distinguished from enterprises of a similar nature by a generally high level of all the contributions, so that in its aggregate it is a valuable and convenient instrument of reference for the major constitutional developments of the years 1944–46. In spite of the generally good quality of the articles, some deserve special attention. The article by Hazard is distinguished as a comprehensive, accurate ac-

count of Russian developments; the article by Bopp is a fine study of the evolution of the central banking institutions of England and France preceding their nationalization; the article by Bellquist is a competent survey of Scandinavian developments since the first World War; a little gem is Zink's description of the Alice in Wonderland atmosphere which permeated the origins of our Military Government for Germany. The defects of the collection appear rather in its organization as a whole than in its single contributions. There are, above all, the obvióus *lacunae* of Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Spain, Poland, Hungary, and the Balkans; and an article on our military government in Germany can hardly be considered an adequate covering of the German problem. A more serious defect is the absence of an over-all view of European political problems. There is hardly a trace of awareness that Hitler's attempt to conquer and unite Europe was more than the freakish idea of a power-lusting tyrant, and that European post-Hitler politics has to be measured in terms of success in achieving by democratic means what Hitler failed to achieve by totalitarian means. Moreover, there seems to be no awareness at all that the population of Europe west of Russia is as large as the combined populations of the United States and the Soviet Union, and that disorder in this gigantic, dynamic center of Western Civilization has consequences for the rest of the world of which we have not yet seen the beginnings. Such an over-all view might have been supplied by the introductory and concluding articles of the collection, but regrettably the authors have not availed themselves of the opportunity. The "Introduction" by David Fellman is hardly more than a presentation of the contributors to the reader. The concluding article on "Continuity and Change in European Governments," by J. G. Heinberg, does no more than assure us soothingly that, in spite of all change, European politics shows plenty of continuity just like Missouri.—ERIC VOEGELIN.

Constitutions, Electoral Laws, and Treaties of the States in the Near and Middle East (Duke University Press, pp. xix, 446, $5.00), by Helen Miller Davis, adds a much-needed volume to the expanding field of Middle Eastern studies. A result of laborious search for documentary sources (not an easy task in the Orient), the book constitutes the first very successful and truly scholarly codification of the fundamental legal instruments of ten countries in the Middle East. Part I, entitled "States in the Near and Middle East," contains basic laws and treaties of nations in alphabetical order from Afghanistan to Turkey; Part II contains multilateral treaties and agreements, and includes—to mention but a few—such documents as the Sykes-Picot Agreement, the Saadabad Pact, and the Pact of the Arab League. Works of this sort are generally regarded as reference books—and this in the long run will be the rôle of Mrs. Davis' volume. But to some

this book will be more than that: it will be regarded as a necessary introduction to the study of this fascinating part of the world, the true importance of which seems to be more and more vindicated by the current political crisis. Sweeping generalizations made by people only superficially acquainted with the East, such as "the prevailing feudal system" in the area, etc., may well be checked against the texts of these various documents. And while it is true that the study of constitutions and treaties alone cannot be sufficient for any one who wishes to acquaint himself with realities of life, the dry letters of law may disclose certain trends important for the understanding of a nation. The Middle East is an area of awakening nationalism, and this feature finds its full expression in the texts of the constitutions, even of those granted—under pressure of events—by Mandatory Powers to mandated territories. Another significant feature is that most of these fundamental laws follow the Western constitutional pattern. The exceptions are the laws of the more primitive countries such as Saudi Arabia or Afghanistan whose traditional paternalism induced the lawmakers to concentrate most authority in the hands of a hereditary monarch. There is no evidence of the influence of Soviet political theory on these basic laws. Even the Turkish constitution, while stressing that the state is "secular" and "revolutionary," follows the Western parliamentary system. The treatment of religion offers, in contrast to the preceding similarities, an interesting example of diversity. From an almost theocratic conception adopted in Afghanistan and Arabia, we are led through the intermediary category of official state religions in Egypt, Transjordan, and Iraq to the modern, liberal conception of complete religious tolerance in the Turkish and Lebanese constitutions. It is to be regretted that the author of this monumental compilation has not included the text of the Lausanne Treaty, so essential for any student of Turkish affairs. Political universalists will, however, be cheered by the fact that the United Nations Charter has been reproduced *in extenso*.—GEORGE LENCZOWSKI.

In the May, 1946, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* there is recorded the history of various phases of life in *The Netherlands During German Occupation* by persons who took a leading rôle in the resistance movement. Though each is a specialist in the field about which he writes, the underlying theme of all the contributors is the battle of the underground against the hostile occupation. The articles, twenty-one in number, are grouped under the following headings: "Political and Civil Life," "Economic Life," "Standards of Living," "Cultural Life," and "The Resistance." The costs of occupation and resistance were tremendous. One writer frankly admits that the defeats of the Resistance were more numerous than the victories, and that the struggle had no great importance from a military standpoint. It was nevertheless important

because it "demonstrated the stamina of our people." The historian J. M. Romein, basing his conclusions in part upon a report of the Association for Opinion Study, attempts an assessment of the conduct of different classes of people toward the invader. To the doctors, priests, ministers, and students, are awarded the honors. The majority of the public servants and laborers conducted themselves only fairly well, the members of the judiciary even less well, while manufacturers and contractors were most coöperative with the German authorities. All students of the social sciences will find valuable material in this collection of articles.—AMRY VANDENBOSCH.

A decade ago, a study of the economy of the Netherlands Indies was begun for the International Research Committee of the Institute of Pacific Relations by Professor J. H. Boeke of the University of Leyden. Although the work was interrupted by war and the author for a time incarcerated in a German concentration camp, the first part was published in 1942 under the title of *The Structure of Netherlands Indian Economy*. The second part, entitled *The Evolution of Netherlands Indies Economy* (Netherlands and Netherlands Indies Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, pp. xii, 180, $2.50 cloth, $2.00 paper), now makes its appearance. The study centers in an analysis of the impact of the depression of the thirties upon the economy of the country. The author begins by tracing with sure broad strokes the evolution of Netherlands Indian economy from the time of the first coming of the European to the beginning of the depression. With the coming of the white man, the dualism of Western and native production came into being. Because of its larger means and superior techniques, Western production gained the ascendancy, and native production was pushed more and more into the background. When the capitalist interests found that they were not able with their own resources to cope with the problems created by the depression, they called upon the government for help. The government responded, but not as an instrument of the capitalist interests. It intervened to protect and promote the national economy as a whole. The result is that although Western capital still controls the economy of the country, it has had to accept growing intervention of government in economic affairs. The author concludes that a form of coöperation between government and Western business has come into being which will dominate the economic future of the Netherlands Indies.—RALPH A. NOREM.

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND RELATIONS

Now that the building of government on the international level has taken a fresh start and international agencies are being established for almost every conceivable kind of coöperation among national govern-

ments, the task of keeping informed on the most significant developments by reliance on official documents becomes every day more staggering, while textbooks are and always will be hopelessly out of date, except as they supply historical background, general descriptions of structure, and theoretical observations. As the old anarchic society of nations becomes better organized and an international community shows signs of emerging, teachers and students of the subject need something more than scattered articles and isolated facts. The mass of official raw materials should be digested and organized in readable form at brief intervals. This need is now being met by the World Peace Foundation, not completely but reasonably well, in the first number of its new journal, *International Organization*, published in February, 1947 (278 pages, $1.25). Other full issues will appear in June and September and an index supplement will complete the first volume in November. (Annual subscription price, $3.50.) The new publication gets off to a very satisfactory start under the direction of a board of editors whose names are well known to the profession. The introductory note by Harvey H. Bundy explaining the reason for launching the periodical is followed by three scholarly articles: Leland M. Goodrich on "From League of Nations to United Nations"; Philip E. Mosely on "Peace-Making, 1946"; and Dwight E. Lee on "The Genesis of the Veto." One-half of the first number consists of readable summaries of the 1946 activities of (1) eight organs of the United Nations, (2) nine specialized organizations, (3) thirteen other general international organizations, (4) three regional organizations, and (5) numerous war and transitional organizations. Eighty pages of illustrative documents and twenty pages of selected bibliography conclude the first number and help to make the new journal a welcome and indispensable tool.—JACOB VAN DER ZEE.

Professor Allan G. B. Fisher's latest book, *International Implications of Full Employment in Great Britain* (Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1946, pp. 202, $3.50), is a survey of the relationship between two broad economic policy objectives to which Great Britain is now committed, full employment and the restoration of an open economic order. Under Article VIII of the Mutual Aid Agreement settling Lend-Lease, England has pledged herself to work for freer international trade by ending exchange controls, import quotas, and other restrictive devices. But will England's concern with domestic full employment permit her to accept the continual shifting of resources and unemployment that an economy subject to changes in the demands of foreign customers must expect? Sir William Beveridge has indicated that the advantages of world trade are probably worth the price of unemployment of one per cent. Professor Fisher is apparently willing to pay much more. The author forthrightly expounds a

thesis he has developed in his past works, namely, the conflict between security and progress. Full-employment policy may seek stability by producing such rigidities in economic life that the future rise in the standard of living may be impaired. Also the deliberate reduction of foreign trade to insure the economy from the shock of changes in its magnitude and composition denies consumers the right to buy what they wish. Lastly, the supposed security of employment gained through blocs and bilateralism is likely to prove an illusion in the long run. Eventually a nation is forced to adjust the use of its resources to a new situation. An open system can make adjustments gradually; a closed system merely postpones the day of adjustment. The value of Professor Fisher's book to Americans lies in the realization that our international trade, although not appearing large to us, is important to all other economies. Fluctuations in American employment result in even greater fluctuations in American trade. Depression and reduced imports by the United States bring chaos to other countries. While we ourselves must avoid the dangers of adopting policies that would also lessen flexibility in the use of our resources, the maintenance of high employment in the United States appears an essential requirement if freer trade is to exist throughout the world.—A. MORGNER.

Dr. Hildebrando Accioly's standard three-volume treatise on public international law, published originally in Portuguese in 1932 and later translated into French, has now appeared in a revised Spanish edition: *Tratado de derecho internacional público* (Imprensa nacional, Rio de Janeiro, 1945, 3 v., pp. xxvi, 664, vii, 519, viii, 645). Not a work of the originality of his Brazilian colleague, Dr. Clovis Bevilaqua (*Direito publico internacional*, Rio de Janeiro, 1911, 2 v.), nor of the profundity of the distinguished Cuban jurist, Dr. Antonio Sánchez de Bustamante y Sirven (*Derecho internacional público*, La Habana, 1933–1938, 5 v.), this nevertheless is a descriptive and inductive analysis of scope and depth. Written in beautiful, clear, forceful—albeit formal—style, Dr. Accioly has combined his broad practical experience in the field of international relations (ambassador of Brazil, secretary-general of the Ministry of Foreign Relations, Brazilian delegate to the Lima Conference, etc.) and his sound research training (author of eight other substantial works) to provide an excellent text for courses in international law in Latin American institutions of higher learning. Indeed, the book may in some ways be considered a criterion of instructional method and course content in Latin American universities. Although there are not the slightest grounds for concluding that the author is trying to prove the existence of an American international law, he does employ a large number of examples and illustrations from the Western Hemisphere, particularly Brazil. This should not imply

either that Dr. Accioly has minimized other sources. His bibliography is rich in the best works published, although especially valuable for the Portuguese and Spanish references. He very naturally was concerned as to whether the book should be revised and published before the termination of the Second World War, but concluded, probably rightly, that whatever the future status of international law under a revitalized league of states, or possibly world government, the evolutionary perspective of international law would possess scholarly and utilitarian merit.—WILLIAM S. STOKES.

The Naval War College's *International Law Documents, 1944–45* (Government Printing Office, 1946, pp. v, 266, $1.00), prepared in collaboration with Professor P. S. Wild, of Harvard University, contains seventeen numbers dealing, as the preface explains, "with international law in its relation to the conduct of the war just ended." The first and lengthiest of these documents is a discussion of the history, theory, and practice of contraband of war, concluding that "contraband of war still remains a valid concept" (p. 99). The remaining numbers relate to the organization of the international community; Inter-American affairs; the trial of war criminals; Japanese-American and Japanese-Soviet relations; German and Japanese surrender; and the treatment of a defeated Germany, of the Axis satellites in Europe, and of the liberated European states. Needless to say, the reader must remember that some of the international agreements reprinted, such as the Crimea and Potsdam Declarations, are incomplete as judged by subsequent events and revelations. He must thus bear in mind that documents published in time of war do not always reveal the full story of the evolution of the international laws of war or of the practices actually espoused and followed in the midst of conflict and after hostilities have terminated.—GEORGE MANNER.

International trade generally and foreign trade of a specific country are not the exclusive domain of government reports. Moreover, any one who attempts to analyze and evaluate the foreign trade of the USSR during the past two decades exclusively on the basis of government reports is less than naive. This error of judgment appears to be reflected in the small volume *Soviet Foreign Trade* (Princeton University Press, 1946, pp. 100, $2.00), by Alexander M. Baykov. The author's previous work, *The Development of the Soviet Economic System*, is unquestionably the most scholarly treatise on the subject, its obvious shortcomings notwithstanding. In contrast, the brief essay under review falls short of its stated purpose, namely, "to describe the Soviet system of foreign trade in force on the eve of the Second World War, to analyze the actual development of foreign trade in the USSR in the past, and to stress facts which seem likely

to influence the development of Soviet foreign trade in the postwar period." The "Annex on Soviet-American Trade Relations" would seem to indicate that the author never observed at close range foreign trade and commercial relations between the two countries. Likewise, in the light of cross-current global political dynamics, the author's discussion apropos of the impact of German reparations upon future Soviet foreign trade is a far cry from the prevailing state of affairs, even from an apologetic point of view.—CHARLES PRINCE.

The Department of State publication, *Participation of the United States Government in International Conferences, July 1, 1941–June 30, 1945* (Department of State Publication 2665, Conference Series 89), is a continuation, with some modifications, of *American Delegations to International Conferences, Congresses, and Expositions, and American Representation on International Institutions and Commissions*, covering the period from July 1, 1932, to June 30, 1941. The present volume carries on through the war years the record of international conferences in which the United States participated. Fifty-three conferences are included, nearly half of which were held within the general framework of permanent organizations. The information given for each conference includes, as a rule, the names of the American delegates, the organization of the gathering, and a summary of achievements. An appendix provides an alphabetical and annotated list of international organizations of which the United States is a member or in whose work it participates. This publication is a very useful one for students of international affairs.—NORMAN L. HILL.

Raymond M. Davis' *The World Begins to Live* (Dorrance and Co., 1947, pp. vi, 131, $1.50) is "designed and written for high school youth" (p. 10). Chapters are devoted to the organization and evaluation of the League of Nations, emphasizing that "in the last analysis it was not the League that failed but the individual nations that comprised its membership" (p. 46). Other chapters deal with "Planning for Peace" and an appeal to individuals and organizations alike to support the United Nations "with all the strength at our command" (p. 112). There is appended a draft constitution for a United Nations conceived by Mr. Davis.—W. LEON GODSHALL.

POLITICAL THEORY AND MISCELLANEOUS

Professors should, I think, show some modesty when they evaluate the work of those outside the ranks of professional scholars. Joseph Lewis, in his *Thomas Paine, Author of the Declaration of Independence* (New York: Free Thought Press Association, 1947, pp. xix, 315, $3.00), makes this peculiarly difficult. None can question the sincerity of this disciple of Thomas Paine and Robert G. Ingersoll; nor need one question the proposi-

tion that Paine was one of the most successful of political writers. But did Paine actually write the basic draft of the Declaration of Independence? Lewis argues that Paine *must* have written it. He notes similarities of style between Paine's *Common Sense*, especially, and the Declaration, the use of certain words like "hath," Paine's opposition to slavery, and other matters; and that since Jefferson and Adams could not have written it (being in thought and style incapable of it), Paine is left as the true and only author. Lewis does not show that Paine actually did write it, and most of the arguments submitted can be given other interpretations. He does not prove that Paine in his ideas was original, since the history of republican and natural law theory makes this quite impossible. "In fact, it is my firm conviction," says Lewis, "that Jefferson . . . sought not only Paine's advice, but actually asked him to write the Declaration of Independence, *if Paine had not already done so!* . . . Only one member of that committee was capable of doing it—that man was Benjamin Franklin, *and he did not write it*" (pp. 85–86). Lewis has devoted considerable space to showing Jefferson's opportunism (e.g., the deletion of the anti-slave-trade clause in the Declaration), and the implication emerges that Jefferson got practically all of his ideas from Paine. But to admit the close contact between Jefferson and Paine does not prove that the appointed committee of the Continental Congress did not prepare the Declaration or that Jefferson was mendacious when he said he drafted it. We can all admit the importance of Thomas Paine and his influence on the course of the American Revolution without agreeing with Lewis that Paine *must* have written the Declaration.—FRANCIS G. WILSON.

George W. Gobles' *The Design of Democracy* (University of Oklahoma Press, 1946, pp. viii, 248, $2.75), written by a man of obvious good-will, brings together many ideas regarding democracy with which the majority of Americans will not disagree except in detail. On the other hand, embedded in this generally accepted material are both philosophical assumptions and working conclusions that will be challenged from various quarters. The present reviewer, for example, disagrees with much that is said and implied by the following sentences: "Now if physical laws, once thought to be universal and immutable, are such unreal, unstable, and transitory things, how much more so are principles of the social world, where human conduct, will, motive, instincts, and emotions are more deeply involved (p. 5) . . . There is . . . a non-idealistic side of democracy —a side which people can see and feel more keenly than they can sense or appreciate the idealistic" (p. 7). It is only fair to state that this position is counterbalanced to some extent by other passages—for example: "We must be as efficient as we can and yet be free" (p. 230). The chief argument of the book is that "democracy consists of certain procedures, set up for

the attainment of ends which we deem desirable" (p. 7). These procedures are classified into four groups: those for the maintenance of individual liberties; those for the promotion of order and national unity through mutual adjustment; those for the maintenance of powers which make government responsible to the people; and those for the maintenance of the responsibility of industry "to its employees and to the people, and for the promotion of economic security" (p. 8). Good and sensible things are said about all these matters. In fact, the book will be a useful introduction to democratic thinking along lines very slightly left of center, for the use of young persons and of others needing a simplified presentation. It has very little to offer that is new; but this lack is not serious in a book described as a "primer." The chief fault of the volume is its monotonous style; the chief virtue, its genuine concern for the democratic way of life.—MIRIAM E. OATMAN.

The January, 1947, issue of *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (Vol. 249, $2.00 paper, $2.50 cloth) publishes nineteen articles under the title "Social Implications of Modern Science," edited by Harold M. Dorr. The sequence was initially presented as a series of lectures in the 1946 summer session of the University of Michigan. The individuals who participated in this integrating survey are representatives of several universities, and all are distinguished in their fields. High quality in the essays is therefore not surprising. The articles are grouped into five sections. The first, "Technology and Society," presents a synopsis of recent developments in the natural sciences and undertakes a preliminary evaluation of their social consequences. The second section, "Political Implications," includes four contributions by political scientists. It is concerned essentially with the probable effects of atomic warfare and science on nationalism, world government, civil liberties, and the democratic order. This section will probably be of most interest and value to political scientists. "Science and Social Change," the third section, deals with the anatomy of social change from the viewpoints of psychology, technology, law, and economics. A fourth section, "Conjunction of Social and Physical Sciences," is concerned with the implementation of certain select social fields (e.g., public health) by physical science. A final section considers "The Problem of Values." In his foreword to the issue, Harold M. Dorr states that the design of the series was to "take stock of scientific and technological advances, to anticipate their social consequences, to appraise their potential values, and to examine proposed changes in social organization designed to accommodate man to the new world of science and, at the same time, to insure him against the dangers inherent in the new forces." While the composite does not, of course, wholly accomplish this task, it does have great merit both as a preliminary survey of these

relationships and in suggesting the outlines of integration. Necessarily, the scope of the series requires the consideration of selected, if important, topics only. It is also notable that while some of the authors are concerned with the interrelations of social science with natural science as a whole, others treat their subjects almost exclusively with reference to recent atomic developments. In general, however, the cumulative effect *is* one of integration, and the collection is both provocative and discerning.—THOMAS P. JENKIN.

A sociologist, Professor George A. Lundberg, again poses the fundamental question, *Can Science Save Us?* (Longmans, Green and Co., 1947, pp. 122; paper, $1.00; cloth, $1.75), to which all students of human relations as well as the general public must give renewed attention. Raising and then answering the typical objections to application of the scientific method in the search for solutions to social problems, the author in effect exhorts us to bypass outmoded thoughtways and to go forward with the task of inventing new techniques of appraisal and prediction indispensable for producing the knowledge upon which we can act in seeking to attain mankind's social goals. Idealism unbalanced by scientific criteria as to requirements and costs is declared a social liability. Careful to confine the social scientist to those tasks for which he is fitted, Professor Lundberg would have the state hold social "authorities" to exacting standards in the same way as other professionals. The treatment of the scientist in his dual rôles of researcher and citizen is especially timely; and equally so is the excellent analysis of the function and content of general education in a scientific age. Though the subject of this little book by its very nature invariably provokes many caveats from trained observers of social phenomena and laymen alike, it is so compelling that every political scientist should familiarize himself with Professor Lundberg's distinguished affirmation of faith. The book deserves a wide audience.—LUTHER J. LEE, JR.

Nazism and its ilk may be officially dead, but, according to current reports from Europe, antisemitism is still rife. Though no longer promoted or sanctioned officially, it appears to be more virulent than in pre-Hitler days. The persistence of the phenomenon baffles conscientious non-Jews. It continues to perplex even the best of Jewish students of the problem, judging by the fourteen *Essays on Antisemitism* (New York, 1946, pp. xi, 265, $2.50), collected in the second volume of the Jewish Social Studies, edited by Koppel S. Pinson, and brought out by the Conference on Jewish Relations. In this, a revised and enlarged edition of the 1942 volume, five essays are devoted, severally, to a survey of antisemitism in the postwar world, to economic, social, and psychological aspects of the problem, and

to defenses against antisemitism. Attention may be called to the scholarly contributions of Israel S. Wechsler and Bernard D. Weinryb. Nine historical and regional studies furnish case histories of this social malignancy, in the Hellenistic-Roman world, in the first Christian millennium, in medieval art and law, in Islam, Tsarist Russia, Poland, modern France, and modern Germany. Hannah Arendt's discussion of the Dreyfus case deserves special commendation. Waldemar Gurian offers a balanced, though somewhat simplified, account of Nazi antisemitism. Raphael Mahler has brought his informative discussion of Polish antisemitism completely up to date, including developments as late as April, 1946. On the other hand, Mark Vishniak's essay on antisemitism in Russia would gain greatly in interest and importance if it should, in a future edition, include a discussion of the problem in the Soviet Union, where, all official denials to the contrary, antisemitism continues to survive, though much less prominently than in Tsarist Russia. Readers will appreciate the appended *vitae* of the contributors (pp. 267–269), but will regret the absence of an index to this veritable mine of information. The essayists agree upon no single thesis or solution. Their earnestness, however, challenges other social scientists to help think through once again this age-old problem.—HENRY REIFF.

Although the first American edition of Hilaire Belloc's *The Servile State* (Henry Holt, pp. xxvii, 189, $2.50) bears the date 1946 and includes a new introduction by Christian Gauss, the text is a reprint of the original 1912 edition. Even the author's preface to the English edition of 1927 antedates Nazism, ignores Fascism, and finds peasant-ownership the outstanding characteristic of Soviet Russia. It was capitalism as it existed before the First World War that led Belloc to prophesy the coming of the servile state. Belloc holds the capitalist state inherently unstable and offers three stablizing solutions—the distributive, the collectivist, and the servile state. He maintains that widespread ownership of the means of production was actually attained in the later Middle Ages, but that it would go against the grain of existing capitalist society to attempt to reestablish the distributive state. Collectivism seems the easiest solution, but cannot be secured without the outright confiscation of private property. Modern "socialistic reforms" actually point toward the servile state, in which the great majority are compelled by law to labor for the advantage of the few who own the means of production. When men fear unemployment more than legal compulsion, they are ready for a servile status. When employers and employees are differentiated by legislation on employers' liability, minimum wages, and unemployment insurance, the servile state has begun. The study is provocative rather than convincing. The assimilation of the modern employee to the Roman slave depends

upon a definition of servile status that completely disregards the former's freedom to own consumers' goods and to control his own leisure. Furthermore, the demonstration that society is not headed toward collectivism is undermined, if not destroyed, by the experience of the world since 1912 with the effects of taxation and inflation upon the propertied classes.—MARGARET SPAHR.

Considering the scarcity of materials in 1946, it is to be deplored that some were used up in reprinting Albert Jay Nock's *Our Enemy, the State* (The Caxton Printers, Ltd., pp. 209, $2.50), which first appeared in 1935. Mr. Nock's anarcho-individualism, being definitely atavistic, disables him from appreciating the effect of mass civilization on the problem to which he addresses himself. One need not hold a brief for "statism" to recognize the fact that, in present circumstances, the expansion of "state power" at the expense of "social power" is largely a result of default on the part of the latter and of the consequent popular demand for governmental intervention. Mr. Nock, however, contends that "social power is estopped by sheer fiat" from performing its appropriate functions. His own argument from history, to which the bulk of the book is devoted, does not enlighten him as to the primary causes of this "usurpation." Not only that, but it seems rather pointless. Though it is said that Mr. Nock denied being an economic determinist, he resorts, nevertheless, to an over-simplified economic interpretation of individual and group motives, reminiscent of Charles A. Beard's earlier endeavors. Failing to come to grip with the real issues, Mr. Nock sets up a straw man for himself. First, he affirms the duality of state and government, drawing invidious comparisons between them. Then—being under the influence of Herbert Spencer's organismic theory—he hypostatizes the state. Thus the state ceases to be a mere abstraction, and Mr. Nock is able to ascribe an inherent acquisitiveness to it, and to accuse it of self-aggrandizement. No further comment is needed to show that Mr. Nock's approach is quixotic. —HENRY JANZEN.

Britain was closer to the war than we, yet has produced rather more in proportion of analyses of Nazism that avoid the crudely Manichean approach. The latest is E. K. Bramstedt's *Dictatorship and Political Police; The Technique of Control by Fear* (Oxford University Press, 1947, pp. ix, 275, $4.75), in the "International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction" edited by the late Karl Mannheim. Mr. Bramstedt's central interest is the Nazi Gestapo and its branches, the *SS* and the *Sicherheitsdienst*. While there is perhaps too much description of their organization, and too little analysis of the factors extending beyond German politics that gave rise to such organizations and methods, the book assumes that

they are explainable. In the sober manner familiar to readers of E. H. Carr or Alfred Cobban, it endeavors to get beyond the simple formula of surgery for cancer to something better than mystery in suggesting the causes and the means of future avoidance. The book was written over an extended period during the war, and might have been improved by more thorough rewriting. It sketches the history of the French political police under the two Bonapartes and the Italian Fascist OVRA. But it fails to mention the system in England under Elizabeth, and omits consideration of the Soviet establishment of many names, although with apology for the omission. There are a number of minor faults, some of them due to necessary ignorance or security at the time of writing. The account of the attempt to assassinate Hitler on July 22, 1944, is superficial and gives two different dates. The book also ascribes the origin of colored shirts as political uniforms to an occurrence in Paris in 1869, forgetting Garibaldi's red shirts of 1860, and speaks of sending people to the Bastille in 1800. With all its faults, however, the book is one of the more useful of the multitude of volumes recapitulating some phase of the recent world commotion. The latter parts occasionally reach a high plane, as when the author points out that "the old Fascism has caused defeat and humiliation to nations alien to it, but defeat and humiliation in their turn are fruitful soil for a new Fascism with different sponsors but with similar dangers."—GEORGE S. PETTEE.

In *The Limitist* (W. W. Norton, 1947, pp. 166, $2.00), Fred I. Raymond undertakes two tasks. He does a neat and effective job of showing the disparity between the classical theory of capitalism and its current operation. The legal devices which forestall the operation of the natural principles that were to prevent huge agglomerations of capital are clearly delineated, and the compulsions of the market-place which lead to "giantism" are described. Neither taxation nor regulation has prevented this abuse of capitalist principles. This critical section is excellently done. The next task is to present "constructive suggestions for change." Limitism is the central theme. Limitist laws are those that establish "precise" limits. "Acts within such limits are clearly legal, while acts beyond the limits are clearly illegal." In practice, this would involve the fixing of factual limitations on size of firm or quantity of output in order that violation could be easily established. Other forms of control, such as the "elastic restraint" of regulatory laws and the "discouragement" of tax laws, should be reduced to a minimum. Tentative laws for commerce and agriculture which incorporate limitist principles are outlined. The main issue seems to be the large corporations and the obstacles which they may strew in the way of small firms. Mr. Raymond wants to stop this by prohibiting such socially undesirable developments. The only surprising thing about the proposal

is that it took a business man twenty years to think of it (if the dust jacket may be believed.)—CHARLES B. HAGAN.

In a concise and thorough study, *Freedom of the Movies* (University of Chicago Press, 1947, pp. 241, $3.00), Ruth A. Inglis has examined the "History and Economics," and the "Social Rôle" of the screen, with particular emphasis on its pattern of self-regulation. One of several reports on mass communication by the Commission on Freedom of the Press, it is the best single summary dealing with our American entertainment Frankenstein, and is not likely to be improved upon soon. The Production Code (which is given in full, with commentary on its origins and growth) offers interesting parallels with Plato's strictures on poetry, and more especially the "Reasons Underlying the General Principles" provide matter for a full-size course on art, morals, and their effect on society. But the social scientist will more profitably reflect on the current unwillingness of the movies, even with coaching, to be cast in a positive rôle in public affairs. An industry only recently in a state of financial instability, obliged to reach an "undifferentiated mass audience" with "a sizable number of films every year," has little economic incentive for playing up complex social problems—or lofty aesthetic experiments. The Commission's own introductory statement, calling chiefly for the "motion picture industry to rise to the occasion," is surely as dubious an expectation as any dependence on government regulation or stimulation. The forcible separation of production from distribution is long overdue. But the real answer to monopoly by the "majors"—here as elsewhere—is not moral adjuration on one side or government censorship on the other. It lies in achieving, by subsidy or legal privilege or otherwise, some new form of competition. What is needed, as Miss Inglis briefly urges at the very end, is an increase in specialized audiences: small theaters as outlets for experimental films, original ideas, pioneering personalities. With such outlets, the non-fiction film could some day begin to come into its own, much as the non-fiction best-seller has matured and found public favor in the last twenty years. But it will need subsidy. And neither Washington nor Hollywood seems to be an early candidate for that. Would not the development of non-fiction film production be as fit a subject as the public library for coöperation between communities and philanthropic foundations? Would not a five- or ten-year program meet a crying need for motion picture progress both as a teaching instrument and as an outlet for the social sciences?—RICHARD DYER MACCANN.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF POLITICAL INTEREST

BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

MULFORD Q. SIBLEY
AND
MARJORIE H. SIBLEY
University of Illinois

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC LAW

Books and Pamphlets

Abelarde, Pedro E. American tariff policy towards the Philippines. Pp. 241. N. Y.: King's Crown. 1947.

Abrams, Charles. A housing program for America. Pp. 32. N. Y.: League for Industrial Democracy. 1947.

Binkley, W. E. President and congress. Pp. 312. N. Y.: A. A. Knopf. 1947.

Browder, Earl R. War or peace with Russia? Pp. 190. N. Y.: A. A. Wyn. 1947.

Budenz, Louis F. This is my story [Communist party]. Pp. 394. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill. 1947.

Commission on Freedom of the Press. A free and responsible press; a general report on mass communication. Pp. 150. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press. 1947.

Crum, John H. Behind the silken curtain; a personal account of Anglo-American diplomacy in Palestine and the Middle East. Pp. 311. N. Y.: Simon & Shuster. 1947.

Cummins, E. E., and *De Vyver, F. T.* The labor problem in the United States; 3rd ed. Pp. 601. N. Y.: Van Nostrand. 1947.

Curtis, C. P. Lions under the throne; a study of the supreme court of the United States. Pp. 368. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 1947.

Daggett, S., and *Carter, J. P.* The structure of transcontinental railroad rates. Pp. 173. Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Press. 1947.

Davie, Maurice R., and *others.* Refugees in America. Pp. 474. N. Y.: Harper, 1947.

Dennis, Eugene. The people against the trusts. Pp. 64. N. Y.: New Century Pubrs. 1947.

Duggan, J. C. The legislative and statutory development of the federal concept of conscription for military service. Pp. 199. Washington: Cath. Univ. of Amer. 1946.

Foner, Philip S. History of the labor movement in the United States. Pp. 576. N. Y.: Int. Pubrs. 1947.

Jones, J. Mervyn. Full powers and ratification; a study in the development of treaty-making procedure. Pp. 197. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1947.

Latham, Earl, and *Others.* The federal field service. Pp. 70. Chicago: Pub. Admin. Service. 1947.

Levi, Werner. American-Australian relations. Pp. 184. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minn. Press. 1947.

Lord, Russell R. The Wallaces of Iowa. Pp. 628. Boston: Houghton. 1947.

Lutz, Harley L., Magill, Roswell, Tarleau, Thomas N., Hughes, Rowland R., Fairchild, Fred R., and *Cooper, Walter A.* A tax program for a solvent America. Pp. 170. N. Y.: Committee on Postwar Tax Policy. 1947.

Metz, Harold W., and *Jacobstein, Meyer.* A national labor policy. Pp. 164. Washington: Brookings Institution. 1947.

Martin, A. B. and *Chesney, L. W.* Kansas government. Pp. 126. Topeka (Kan.): League of Kansas Municipalities. 1946.

Petrullo, Vincenzo. Puerto Rican paradox. Pp. 187. Phila.: Univ. of Pa. Press. 1947.

Pollard, James E. The presidents and the press. Pp. 879. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1947.

Puttkammer, E. W. Manual on criminal law and procedure. Pp. 89. Chicago: Chicago Commission on Crime, 79 W. Monroe St. 1947.

Short, Lloyd M. Personnel problems affecting social scientists in the national civil service. Pp. 39. N. Y.: Social Sci. Research Council. 1946.

Speiser, Ephraim A. The United States and the near east. Pp. 279. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press. 1947.

Van Til, William. Economic roads for American democracy. Pp. 261. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill. 1947.

Walker, E. E., Beach, W. G., and *Jamison, O. G.* Government of the United States. Pp. 692. N. Y.: Scribner's Sons. 1946.

Ware, Ethel K. A constitutional history of Georgia. Pp. 210. N. Y.: Columbia Univ. Press. 1947.

Westcott, A. F., ed. American sea power since 1775. Pp. 617. Philadelphia: Lippincott. 1947.

Articles

Administrative Law. The federal administrative procedure act. *Herbert Kaufman.* Boston Univ. Law Rev. Nov., 1946.

———. The federal administrative procedure act. *Ray A. Brown.* Wis. Law Rev. Jan., 1947.

Agriculture. Farmer coöperatives. *Paul J. Foley.* Taxes. Mar., 1947.

Airspace. Judicial determination of rights in airspace. *John A. Eubank.* Dickinson Law Rev. Mar., 1947.

Alien Property. Enemy business enterprises and the alien property custodian, part I. *Francis X. Fallon, Jr.* Fordham Law Rev. Nov., 1946.

Army and Navy. The peacetime army: warriors need not apply. *Eric Larrabee.* Harper's. Mar., 1947.

———. In defense of the army mind. *John J. McCoy.* Harper's. Apr., 1947.

Banking and Currency. National banks and protective state laws. *T. L. Wentling.* Dickinson Law Rev. Mar., 1947.

Bankruptcies. Jurisdiction of primary and ancillary courts in ordinary bankruptcies. *Reuben G. Hunt.* Commercial Law Jour. Mar., 1947.

Bar. World peace and the lawyer. *John F. Schmidt.* Jour. of Am. Judicature Soc. Feb., 1947.

Business. The entertainment industry and the federal antitrust law. *Bernard Reich.* So. Calif. Law Rev. Dec., 1946.

———. The real estate lobby. *A. L. Crosby.* Am. Mercury. Mar., 1947.

———. Unfair competition without competition? *Rudolf Callmann.* Univ. of Pa. Law Rev. Mar., 1947.

———. The airlines face a crisis. *R. H. Estabrook.* Am. Mercury. Mar., 1947.

Checks and Balances. Government—checked and balanced. *Wallace Mendelson.* Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar. Mar., 1947.

Civil Liberties. Rights under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments against injuries inflicted by private individuals. *R. L. Hale.* Civil rights legislation before and after the passage of the 14th amendment. *W. E. B. Dubois.* Lawyers Guild Rev. Dec., 1946.

———. Exemption from the draft; a study in civil liberties. *Julien Cornell.* Yale Law Jour. Jan., 1947.

———. A federal prosecutor looks at the civil rights statutes. *Tom C. Clark.* Columbia Law Rev. Mar., 1947.

Communications. Federal legislation regulating radio. *Martin J. McManus, Jr.* So. Calif. Law Rev. Feb., 1947.

Congress. The congressional reorganization. *Estes Kefauver.* Jour. of Pol. Feb., 1947.

———. The second session of the seventy-ninth congress. *Floyd M. Riddick.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. Feb., 1947.

Conservation. Congress must reclaim reclamation. *Hugh Butler.* Pub. Util. Apr. 10, 1947.

Constitutional Law. The rights of states interposition. *Howard N. Morse.* Dickinson Law Rev. Mar., 1947.

Crime and Criminal Law. Partial insanity as affecting the degree of crime—a commentary on Fisher v. United States. *Herman L. Taylor.* Calif. Law Rev. Dec., 1946.

———. Insanity as a defense to homicide in Pennsylvania. *Burton R. Laub.* Temple Law Quar. Dec., 1946.

———. The new federal rules of criminal procedure; part II. *George H. Dession.* Yale Law Jour. Jan., 1947.

———. Who is the criminal? *Paul W. Tappan.* Am. Sociol. Rev. Feb., 1947.

———. The hijacking racket. *Malcolm Johnson.* Am. Mercury. Apr., 1947.

Education. A report on the treatment of Asia in American textbooks. *Donn V. Hart.* Far Eastern Quar. Nov., 1946.

———. Labor's stake in university education. *Louis Hollander.* Labor and Nation. Jan.–Feb., 1947.

———. Paying the cost of a properly organized system of schools. *C. K. Alexander.* The Municipality. Feb., 1947.

———. Adult education—or disaster. *A. Caswell Ellis.* Southwest Rev. Spring. 1947.

Foreign Policy. Sea expansion of the United States of America [in Russian]. *L. Ivanov.* World Economics and Politics [Russian]. Sept., 1946.

———. Economic plans of the U.S.A. in China [in Russian]. *N. Vainzveig.* World Economics and Politics [Russian]. Oct.–Nov., 1946.

———. Strategical bases of the U.S.A. and Great Britain [in Russian]. *V. Tscheprakov.* World Economics and Politics [Russian]. Oct.–Nov., 1946.

———. The United States in search of a peace policy. *Arnold Wolfers.* Int. Affairs. Jan., 1947.

———. A note on the occupation of Iceland by American forces. *John L. Zimmerman.* Pol. Sci. Quar. Mar., 1947.

———. Our treaty procedure versus our foreign policies. *John Sloan Dickey.* For. Affairs. Apr., 1947.

Foreign Service. The American foreign service since 1939. *Elton Atwater.* Am. Jour. of Int. Law. Jan., 1947.

Foreign Trade. Free trade with Canada. *O. G. Villard.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Jan., 1947.

———. Foreign trade policy of the United States. *Harold H. Hutcheson.* For. Policy Rep. Mar. 15, 1947.

Guam. Crisis on Guam. *Laura Thompson.* Far Eastern Quar. Nov., 1946.

Health. A year of transition from war to peace. *Walter Clarke.* Jour. of Soc. Hygiene. Jan., 1947.

———. Health insurance plans under union-management agreements. *John M. Brumm.* Jan.–Feb., 1947.

———. Responsibility of the health officer in a medical care program. *F. W. Jackson.* Am. Jour. of Pub. Health. Mar., 1947.

Inflation. Postscript on war inflation. *W. J. Fellner.* Am. Econ. Rev. Mar., 1947.

Intergovernmental Relations. Intergovernmental coöperation in the Tennessee valley. *M. H. Satterfield.* Jour. of Pol. Feb., 1947.

Interstate Commerce. Some heretical remarks on the federal power over commerce. *Frederick Green.* Law Rev. Jan., 1947.

Judiciary. The work of the Mississippi supreme court, 1942–1946: Public law. *Littleton Upshur.* Taxation. *Francis S. Bowling.* Miss. Law Jour. Dec., 1946.

———. Benjamin N. Cardozo. *Luther M. Swygert.* Notre Dame Lawyer. Jan., 1947.

———. Judges: their selection and tenure. *Laurance M. Hyde.* Minor courts in state constitutions. *E. R. Sutherland.* Jour. of Am. Judicature Soc. Feb., 1947.

———. Disqualification of judges. *A. B. Neil.* Tenn. Law Rev. Feb., 1947.

———. Judge Learned Hand. *Felix Frankfurter* and *C. C. Burlingham.* The literary style of Learned Hand. *George W. Pepper.* Judge Learned Hand and the work of the American law institute. *H. F. Goodrich.* Judge Learned Hand's contribution to public law. *C. E. Wyzanski, Jr.* Judge Learned Hand and the interpretation of statutes. *Archibald Cox.* Judge Learned Hand and the law of patents and copyrights. *Stephen H. Philbin.* Judge Learned Hand and the criminal. *Orrin G. Judd.* Harvard Law Rev. Feb., 1947.

Labor. The war labor board and management functions. *Ludwig Teller.* N. Y. Univ. Law Quar. Rev. July, 1946.

———. The status of foremen as "employees" under the national labor relations act. *H. E. Cooper.* Fordham Law Rev. Nov., 1946.

———. The Negro worker in Chicago industry. *Dorothy M. Powell.* Jour. of Bus. Jan., 1947.

———. The fair labor standards act. *Leon H. Wallace.* Ind. Law Jour. Jan., 1947.

———. Protection of labor union funds by members' representative suits: Massachusetts practice. *John A. Perkins.* Boston Univ. Law Rev. Jan., 1947.

———. Labor faces the future. *Louis Hollander, Walter Reuther,* and *Others.* Labor and Nation. Jan.–Feb., 1947.

———. New ways to write laws. *Alfred F. Conard.* Yale Law Jour. Feb., 1947.

———. The crisis of capitalism. *J. C. O'Mahoney.* Survey Graphic. Feb., 1947.

———. Why men strike. *Peter F. Drucker.* Fortnightly. Feb., 1947.

———. Utility labor bills in state capitals. *J. J. Hassett.* Pub. Util. Feb. 27, 1947.

———. Labor and the communists. *Hilda Fisher.* Current Hist. Mar., 1947.

———. Expansion and employment. *E. D. Domar.* Am. Econ. Rev. Mar., 1947.

———. Attitudes of "progressive" trade-union leaders. *Alvin W. Gouldner.* Am. Jour. of Sociol. Mar., 1947.

———. "Portal-to-portal"—survey and destiny. *B. B. Wolson.* Commercial Law Jour. Mar., 1947.

———. Employees' suits under the fair labor standards act. *A. B. Gerber* and *S. H. Galfand.* Univ. of Pa. Law Rev. Mar., 1947.

———. Economics and full employment. *Raymond D. Thomas.* Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar. Mar., 1947.

———. The uncomfortable paradise of full employment. *Robert L. Heilbroner.* Harper's. Apr., 1947.

———. How miners live. *A. H. Raskin.* Am. Mercury. Apr., 1947.

Law. Fee schedules—a device in preventive law. *W. N. Wherry.* N. Y. Univ. Law Quar. Rev. July, 1946.

Naturalization. American citizenship; can applicants qualify their allegiance? *Editors.* Am. Bar Assn. Jour. Feb., 1947.

Personalities. "John Roy Carlson": Curious phenomenon. *John T. Flynn.* Catholic World. Mar., 1947.

———. Stassen of Minnesota. *Roscoe Drummond.* Am. Mercury. Mar., 1947.

———. The decline and fall of Burton K. Wheeler. *Joseph K. Howard.* Harper's. Mar., 1947.

———. Henry Wallace. *Dwight Macdonald.* Politics. Mar.–Apr., 1947.

———. Louis Brandeis: people's attorney, *A. T. Mason.* Am. Mercury. Apr., 1947.

Personnel. The personnel office and individual employee problems. *H. W. Johnstone.* Person. Admin. Jan., 1947.

———. Civilian personnel administration in the war department. *Donald A. Rutlidge.* Pub. Admin. Rev. Winter, 1947.

Political Leaders. Issues and leaders in Washington. *Marquis Childs.* Yale Rev. Spring, 1947.

Political Parties. Third party? Not yet. *Editors.* Labor and Nation. Jan.–Feb., 1947.

———. The changing outlook for a realignment of parties. *A. N. Holcombe.* Pub. Opin. Quar. Winter, 1946–47.

Presidency. The third term issue. *Arthur M. Schlesinger.* Am. Mercury. Apr., 1947.

Public Administration. Procedural due process in the cancellation of air mail route certificates. *E. H. Campbell.* Wash. Law Rev. & State Bar Jour. July, 1946.

———. The rôle of the lawyer in public administration. *J. M. Pfiffner.* So. Calif. Law Rev. Dec., 1946.

———. Perfecting state administration, 1940–1946. *L. K. Caldwell.* Analysis of the process of decision-making. *James L. McCamy.* Pub. Admin. Rev. Winter, 1947.

———. The science of public administration; three problems. *R. A. Dahl.* Pub. Admin. Rev. Winter, 1947.

———. Federal executive reorganization re-examined: a symposium, Part II. *Fritz Morstein Marx* (ed.). IV. Adjusting the departmental system. *Lloyd M. Short.* V. Systematizing congressional control. *Robert M. La Follette, Jr.* VI. Political limitations on executive reorganization. *Avery Leiserson.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. Feb., 1947.

Public Opinion. Isolationism and the middle west. *W. G. Carleton.* Miss. Valley Hist. Rev. Dec., 1946.

———. Soviet news in the "New York Times." *Martin Kriesberg.* Pub. Opin. Quar. Winter, 1946–47.

———. Toward world surveying. *Stuart C. Dodd.* Are public opinion polls fair to organized labor? *Arthur Kornhauser.* An analysis of rumor. *Gordon Allport* and *Leo Postman.* Pub. Opin. Quar. Winter, 1946–47.

———. The "liberals" pounce on Schuschnigg. *Erik v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn.* Catholic World. Mar. 1947.

———. This time and last time. *Frederick L. Allen.* Harper's, Mar., 1947.

Public Utilities. The man behind the telephone. *L. D. Farrar.* Should state commissions regulate utility labor relations? *Roscoe Ames.* Pub. Util. Mar. 13, 1947.

———. Nebraska, the public power state, parts I, II, & III. *Judson King.* Pub. Util. Mar. 13, Mar. 27, Apr. 10, 1947.

Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico: an American responsibility. *Olive Holmes.* For. Policy Rep. Mar. 1, 1947.

Race Relations. Race prejudice and Negro-white relations in the army. *E. T. Hall, Jr.* Am. Jour. of Sociol. Mar., 1947.

———. The anti-discrimination trend in state legislatures. *Roscoe Ames.* Pub. Util. Apr. 10, 1947.

Representation. Unrepresentative government. *Allen Duckworth.* Southwest Rev. Spring, 1947.

R.F.C. Look what's in the temple now. *Jesse P. Wolcott.* Nation's Bus. Mar., 1947.

Social Security. Reorganization of workmen's compensation in New York State, 1943–1946. *Mary Donlon.* Pub. Admin. Rev. Winter, 1947.

———. Experience rating in the Texas unemployment compensation program. *Carey C. Thompson.* Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar. Mar., 1947.

State Constitutions. Constitutional revision and the courts. *W. H. Wicker.* Constitutional revision in a southern state. *W. L. Bradshaw.* Public support for constitutional change. *Charlton F. Chute.* Tenn. Law Rev. Feb., 1947.

State Legislatures. The first general assembly of Iowa. *J. A. Swisher.* Ia. Jour. of Hist. & Pol. Jan., 1947.

———. Improving state legislative procedure and processes. *L. B. Orfield.* Minn. Law Rev. Jan., 1947.

Supreme Court. The United States supreme court, 1936–1946. *Walter F. Dodd.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. Feb., 1947.

Taxation. The treasury interprets the Clifford case. *Joseph B. Lynch.* Fordham Law Rev. Nov., 1946.

———. Practical farm tax problems. *Walter B. Keaton.* Ind. Law Jour. Jan., 1947.

———. Gross receipts taxes on interstate transactions. *Allison Dunham.* Columbia Law Rev. Mar., 1947.

———. Something new in gift and estate taxes. *Lee J. Wolfe.* Taxes. Mar., 1947.

———. A new tax proposal. *Harry Silverson.* Am. Mercury. Mar., 1947.

———. Gift and estate tax implications of family partnerships. *E. N. Polisher.* Dickinson Law Rev. Mar., 1947.

———. Voluntary disclosures in tax fraud and evasion cases. *Murray L. Rachlin.* Tax division, department of justice. *H. P. Locke.* Tax problems of the national government. R. G. Blakey. Taxes, Apr., 1947.

FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

Books and Pamphlets

Bishop, Reginald. Wages and prices in the U.S.S.R. Pp. 24. London: British-Soviet Society. 1946.

Carpenter, C. R. Problems of German reconstruction. Pp. 39. N.Y.: Social Action. 1947.

Ciechanowski, Jan. Defeat in victory [Poland]. Pp. 413. Garden City (N.Y.): Doubleday. 1947.

Clarke, J. J. Outline of local government of the United Kingdom; 15th ed. Pp. 366. London: Pitman & Sons. 1945.

Crossman, Richard H. S. Palestine mission; a personal record. Pp. 218. N.Y.: Harper. 1947.

Edmunds, S. E. Struggle for freedom; the history of Anglo-American liberty from the charter of Henry I to the present day. Pp. 322. Milwaukee: Bruce. 1947.

Ehrenburg, Ilia G. European crossroads; a Soviet journalist in the Balkans; trans. Pp. 176. N.Y.: Knopf. 1947.

Ehrmann, H. W. French labor from popular front to liberation. Pp. 339. N. Y.: Oxford. 1947.

Frye, William. Marshall, citizen soldier. Pp. 397. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill. 1947.

Gordon, Strathearn. Our parliament; 2nd ed. Pp. 175. London: Hansard Society. 1946.

Grant, Michael. From "imperium" to "auctoritas"; a historical study of "aes" coinage in the Roman empire, 49 B.C.–A.D. 14. Pp. 539. N.Y.: Macmillan. 1947.

Guesde, Jules. Jules Guesde. Éd. du centenaire. Introduction et textes choisis par Suzanne Lacore. Pp. 170. Paris: Éditions PERFRAC. 1946.

Hewlett, John. Like moonlight on snow; The life of Simon Iturri Patiño. Pp. 292. N.Y.: R. M. McBride. 1947.

McConkey, Darel. Out of your pocket; the story of cartels. Pp. 120. N.Y.: Pamphlet Press. 1947.

Mendis, G. C. Ceylon under the British. 2nd rev. ed. Pp. 139. London; A. Probsthain. 1946.

Olden, Rudolf. The history of liberty in Germany. Pp. 176. London: V. Gollancz. 1946.

Paul-Boncour, J. Entre deux guerres; souvenirs sur la Troisième Republique; vols. 2 and 3. Pp. 435, 330. N.Y.: Bretano's. 1947.

Riedmatten, Lèon de. Le communisme: d'où vient-il? Où nous mène-t-il? Pp. 119. Versailles: Éditions de l'Observateur. 1946.

Short, Ernest. Railways and the state; the problem of nationalisation. London: Hollis. 1946.

Vernadsky, George. Medieval Russian laws. Pp. 106. N.Y.: Columbia Univ. Press. 1947.

Wilcox, E. V. Acres and people; the eternal problem of China and India. Pp. 297. N.Y.: Orange Judd. 1947.

Wood, G. L., ed. Australia; its resources and development. Pp. 351. N.Y.: Macmillan. 1947.

Articles

Algeria. Evolution in Algeria. *Robert Montagne.* Int. Affairs. Jan., 1947.

Australia. Reports of proceedings at judges' chambers. *F. D. Cumbrae-Stewart.* Section 116 of the constitution and the territories of the commonwealth. *H. T. Gibbs.* Commonwealth control of states. *W. A. Harrison.* Aus. Law Jour. Feb. 14, 1947.

Austria. The economic and political background of Austria. *Victor Heller.* Jour. of Cent. European Affairs. Oct., 1946.

———. Can Austria Survive? *P. O. Lapie.* Fortnightly. Feb., 1947.

Brazil. Economic conditions of Brazil at the present stage [in Russian]. *O. Klesmet.* World Economics and Politics [Russian]. Oct.–Nov., 1946.

British Commonwealth. Socialism and the colonies. *A. Calder-Marshall.* Fortnightly. Feb., 1947.

Canada. The special nature of Canadian federalism. *F. R. Scott.* Patents in relation to monopoly; a rejoinder. *H. G. Fox.* Canadian wartime price controls, 1941–6. *K. W. Taylor.* Statutes, orders, and official statements relating to Canadian wartime economic controls. *Sheila I. Stewart.* Can. Jour. of Econ. & Pol. Sci. Feb., 1947.

———. The Canadian labour movement. *W. E. Greening.* Contemp. Rev. Feb., 1947.

———. Why and how Canada federated. *Wilfrid Eggleston.* Freedom & Union. Mar., 1947.

———. Alignment of parties. *F. R. Scott.* Can. Forum. March, 1947.

———. Social credit in Quebec. *Herbert F. Quinn.* Can. Forum. March, 1947.

———. Taxation of co-operatives. *Ralph S. Staples.* Can. Forum. March, 1947.

———. Recognition of foreign divorces; a reply to a criticism. *Raphael Tuck.* Insanity as a criminal defence. *W. C. Meredith.* Can. Bar Rev. Mar., 1947.

China. Chinese people in struggle against reaction [in Russian]. *V. Avarin.* World Economics and Politics [Russian]. Sept., 1946.

———. A closer view of China's problems. *Francis L. K. Hsu.* Some economic documents relating to the genesis of the Japanese-sponsored regions in north China. *T. K. Koo.* Far Eastern Quar. Nov., 1946.

———. The Chinese in southeast Asia. *Amry Vandenbosch.* Jour. of Pol. Feb., 1947.

———. China's new agony. Destroying the people's livelihood. The Chinese constitution. The Chinese association of labor. China's road to chaos. The way out. *Editors.* Amerasia. Mar., 1947.

———. China's forbidden crisis. *Gunther Stein.* Education in Manchuria. *Everett D. Hawkins.* Far Eastern Survey. Mar. 12, 1947.

———. Social implications of tin-mining in Yunnan. *Shih Kuo-heng.* Pacific Affairs. Mar., 1947.

———. The complex problem of China. *Paul M. A. Linebarger.* Yale Rev. Spring, 1947.

Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia's road to socialism. *Winifred N. Hadsel.* Foreign Policy Rep. Feb. 15, 1947.

Denmark. The golden rule in Denmark. *John Herling.* Survey Graphic. Feb. 1947.

France. The trend of the law in France. *Benjamin H. Conner.* Wis. Law Rev. Jan., 1947.

———. France in crisis. *John Pollock.* Memories of the resistance in France. *Otto Ernst.* Contemp. Rev. Feb., 1947.

———. La charte des sinistrés. *Maurice Langlet.* Le plan Monnet et l'agriculture. *René Cercler.* Étude d'une réforme administrative en Afrique Occidentale et Equatoriale Française. *D. P. de Pedrals.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Feb., 1947.

———. The new French constitution. *André Géraud.* The French financial dilemma. *Charles Rist.* French labor goes left. *Henry W. Ehrmann.* For. Affairs. Apr., 1947.

General and Comparative. The meaning of law in the common law tradition. *Anton-Hermann Chroust.* Notre Dame Lawyer. Jan., 1947.

———. The popular view of bureaucrats. *J. J. Corson.* The French and British views of bureaucrats. *David A. Morse.* Why bureaucracy is belittled. *G. L. Belsley.* Person. Admin. Jan., 1947.

———. Administrative interchange: Brussels and Havana. *H. P. Castleberry.* Pub. Admin. Rev. Winter, 1947.

———. The edict of Diocletian; a study of price-fixing in the Roman empire. *H. Mitchell.* Can. Jour. of Econ. & Pol. Sci. Feb., 1947.

———. Latin American revolutionary cycle. *H. B. Murkland.* Current Hist. Mar., 1947.

———. Administration in Pacific islands. *Felix M. Keesing.* Far Eastern Survey. Mar. 26, 1947.

———. The resistance and the political parties of western Europe. *Gabriel A. Almond.* Pol. Sci. Quar. Mar., 1947.

———. Labor and democracy in Latin America. *Serafino Romnaldi.* For. Affairs. Apr., 1947.

Germany. Agrarian reform in the Soviet zone of occupation of Germany [in Russian]. *A. Petronshov.* World Economics and Politics [Russian]. Sept., 1946.

———. The American denazification program in Germany. *Harold Zink.* Jour. of Cent. European Affairs. Oct., 1946.

———. Quadripartite rule in Berlin. *Anne Whyte.* Int. Affairs. Jan., 1947.

———. Civil service reform in Germany. *Arnold Brecht.* Investigating German personnel management techniques. *J. A. Detlefsen.* Person. Admin. Jan., 1947.

———. The Jewish labor committee and the anti-nazi resistance movement. *Jacob Pat.* Labor and Nation. Jan.–Feb., 1947.

———. Political commissars in the luftwaffe. *Norman E. Caldwell.* Jour. of Pol. Feb., 1947.

———. Can Germany be re-educated? *John Stonborough.* Nat. Rev. Feb., 1947.

———. The German balance sheet. *Felix E. Hirsch.* Current Hist. Mar., 1947.

———. German finance in world war II. *R. W. Lindholm.* Am. Econ. Rev. Mar., 1947.

———. Alternatives for Germany. *Allen W. Dulles.* For. Affairs. Apr., 1947.

Great Britain. Some aspects of the use of statistics in government, with special reference to the human budget. *Lord Woolton.* Jour. of Royal Stat. Soc. Part I, 1946.

———. Struggle around the nationalization of industry in England [in Russian]. *D. Zorina.* World Economics and Politics [Russian]. Oct.–Nov., 1946.

———. National and local finance. *Ursula K. Hicks.* Econ. Jour. Dec., 1946.

———. Change and continuity in the Tudor constitution. *George L. Mosse.* Speculum. Jan., 1947.

———. The trend of the law in England. *Amos J. Peaslee.* Wis. Law Rev. Jan., 1947.

———. Economic situation of Great Britain. *Christopher Hollis.* Soundings. Feb., 1947.

———. Britain's need of manpower. *Editors.* Labour. Feb., 1947.

———. Contemporary conservatism. *W. L. Burn.* Greece and English liberals. *F. A. Voigt.* Nineteenth Cent. Feb., 1947.

———. The nationalization of transport. *Herbert T. Banyard.* Fortnightly. Feb., 1947.

———. Socialist dilemmas. "*B.*" Nat. Rev. Feb., 1947.

———. Witchcraft. *Editors.* Aus. Law Jour. Feb. 14, 1947.

———. Awaiting the crash [Labor cabinet]. *Arthur Page.* Nat. Rev. Mar., 1947.

———. Middle England. *E. L. Woodward.* For. Affairs. Apr., 1947.

Hungary. Hungary's agrarian revolution. *Leland Stowe.* For. Affairs. Apr., 1947.

India. Indian struggle for independence [in Russian]. *V. Bushevitsh.* World Economics and Politics [Russian]. Sept., 1946.

———. The social security movement in India. *A. N. Agarwala.* Econ. Jour. Dec., 1946.

———. Economic planning under the Indian constitutional proposals. *R. K. Mukerjee.* Cotton textile control in India. *M. K. Vellodi.* Indian Christian women and nation-building. *Lady Runganadan.* The place of the Indian Christian community in the new India. *S. D. Malaiperuman.* The proposed new constitution for India with special reference to labour. *Jemnadas Mehta.* India's constitutional task. *H. V. Hodson.* Asiatic Rev. Jan., 1947.

———. Caste in India. *William P. Barton.* Fortnightly. Feb., 1947.

Indo-China. For a French Indo-Chinese federation. Pierre *Gourou.* Annamese nationalism *Dang-chân-Liêu.* Pacific Affairs. Mar., 1947.

Indonesia. Nationalism in Indonesia. *Barbara Whittingham-Jones.* Contemp. Rev. Feb., 1947.

———. Government in Indonesia. *George McT. Kahin.* Far Eastern Survey. Feb. 26, 1947.

———. The Indonesian problem. *J. H. A. Logemann.* Capitalism in Indonesia. *J. S. Furnivall.* Pacific Affairs. Mar., 1947.

Italy. The way of the fascist Italy [in Russian]. *P. Lissovsky.* World Economics and Politics [Russian]. Oct.–Nov., 1946.

———. Italy, cripple or convalescent. *Salvatore Gentili.* Current Hist. Mar., 1947.

Japan. Aspects of personal character in Japan. *D. G. Haring.* Far Eastern Quar. Nov., 1946.

———. Japan after capitulation [in Russian]. *H. Eydus.* World Economics and Politics [Russian]. Oct.–Nov., 1946.

———. Leaders of labor in new Japan. *Mark Starr.* Labor and Nation. Jan.–Feb., 1947.

———. The new Japanese constitution—Part II. *David Nelson Rowe.* Far Eastern Survey. Feb. 12, 1947.

Korea. Civil service comes to Korea. *H. L. Buckardt.* Person. Admin. Jan., 1947.

———. The Korean minority in Japan. *David Conde.* Far Eastern Survey. Feb. 26, 1947.

———. Korea; the first year of liberation. *George M. McCune.* Pacific Affairs. Mar., 1947.

———. The impasse in Korea. *R. T. Oliver.* Am. Mercury. Apr., 1947.

Malaya. Nationalism and politics in Malaya. *P. T. Bauer.* For. Affairs. Apr., 1947.

Manchuria. Manchuria's postwar economy. *Everett D. Hawkins.* Far Eastern Survey. Feb. 12, 1947.

———. The rape of Manchuria. *Georgia Moorad.* Am. Mercury. Mar., 1947.

Mexico. Monetary problems in Mexico. *Raul Ortiz Mena.* Jour. of Bus. Jan., 1947.

New Zealand. New Zealand advances under labor rule. *Marc T. Greene.* United Nations World. Feb., 1947.

Palestine A note on Jewish leaders in Palestine. *Urile G. Foa.* Jewish Soc. Studies. Jan., 1947.

———. Underground in Palestine. *Moshe Brilliant.* Harper's. Mar., 1947.

Poland. The educational institutions of Polish Jewry, 1921–1934. *Nathan Eck.* Jewish Soc. Studies. Jan., 1947.

———. The Polish pantomime. *Freda Bruce Lockhart.* Nineteenth Cent. Feb., 1947.

———. Poland's troubled elections. *Sidney B. Fay.* Current Hist. Mar., 1947.

South Africa. In South Africa today: Whither? *Junius.* Justice. *Charles Don.* Uno's action. *Alexander Campbell.* Nat. Rev. Feb., 1947.

Soviet Union. Soviet law of inheritance; part I. *Vladimir Gsovski.* Mich. Law Rev. Jan., 1947.

———. Trained to raise hell in America [Lenin's School]. *Junius B. Wood.* Nation's Bus. Apr., 1947.

Switzerland. Europe and the Swiss system. *H. G. Daniels,* Contemp. Rev. Feb., 1947.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Books and Pamphlets

Bernstein, Victor H. Final judgment; the story of Nuremberg. Pp. 301. N.Y.: Boni and Gaer. 1947.

Blaine, Anita, Cassels, Edwin H., Embree, Edwin R., Waymack, W. W., and *Wright, Quincy.* The world at the crossroads. Pp. 160. Chicago: World Citizens Assoc. 1947.

Committee Against Mass Expulsion. The land of the dead; study of deportations from eastern Germany. Pp. 32. N.Y.: Author, 112 E. 19 St. 1947.

Dean, Vera Micheles. Russia: menace or promise. Pp. 166. N.Y.: Henry Holt. 1947.

Hankey, Lord, Diplomacy by conference; studies in public affairs, 1920–1946. Pp. 179. N.Y.: Putnam. 1947.

Hart, Liddell, and *Henry, Basil.* The revolution in warfare. Pp. 135. New Haven (Conn.): Yale Univ. Press. 1947.

Hirsch, Richard. The soviet spies; The story of Russian espionage in North America. Pp. 92. N.Y.: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce. 1947.

Jackson, Robert H. The Nuremberg case; together with other documents. Pp. 286. N.Y.: Knopf. 1947.

Jomini, Gen. Antoine H. The art of war. Pp. 161. Harrisburg (Pa.): Military Service Pub. Co. 1947.

Kelley, D. McGlasham. Twenty-two cells in Nuremberg; a psychiatrist examines the Nazi criminals. Pp. 255. N.Y.: Greenberg. 1947.

Livezey, William E. Mahan on sea power. Pp. 347. Norman: Univ. of Okla. Press. 1947.

Mendelssohn, Peter de. Design for aggression; the inside story of Hitler's war plans. Pp. 283. N.Y.: Harper. 1947.

Thomas, Norman M. Appeal to the nations. Pp. 188. N.Y.: Henry Holt. 1947.

Venkatasubbiah, Hiranyappa. Foreign trade of India, 1900–1940. Pp. 83. London: Oxford Univ. Press. 1946.

Articles

Atomic Energy. Which way atomic control? *Thomas J. Hamilton.* Freedom & Union. Mar., 1947.

Canada. Canada's rôle in the search for world peace. *Paul Martin.* Can. Bar Rev. Mar., 1947.

The Church. The church and international affairs. *C. E. Hudson.* Int. Affairs. Jan., 1947.

Diplomacy. The old and the new diplomacy. *E. L. Woodward.* Yale Rev. Spring, 1947.

Displaced Persons. Not sympathy, but action. *W. S. Bernard.* Survey Graphic. Feb., 1947.

———. Places for displaced persons. *Alvin Johnson.* Yale Rev. Spring, 1947.

Hong Kong. The future of Hong Kong. *"Sinimite."* Nat. Rev. Feb., 1947.

India. Hindu and Afghan on the Indian frontier. *William Barton.* Contemp. Rev. Feb., 1947.

International Law. Om begreppen anfall och anfallskrig i historisk belysning. *Helge Granfelt.* Till frågan om internationellt erkännade. *Richard Rank.* Nordisk Tidsskrift for Int. Ret. Vol. 17, 1946.

———. International justice through law. *Wayne L. Morse.* Ore. Law Rev. Dec., 1946.

———. The crime of aggression and the future of international law. *Philip C. Jessup.* Pol. Sci. Quar. Mar., 1947.

International Propaganda. Telling the world about America. *Dick Fitzpatrick.* Pub. Opin. Quar. Winter, 1946–47.

International Trade and Finance. Arbitration! an instrument of sound banking in foreign trade. *Luis Latapi.* Arbitration Jour. Winter, 1946.

———. British and U. S. investment overseas, 1945–1946. *P. D. J. Druiff.* Future of international monetary plans. *R. F. Harrod.* Soundings. Feb., 1947.

———. The international bank. *Nathaniel Weyl* and *M. J. Wasserman.* Am. Econ. Rev. Mar., 1947.

———. The spice of world trade. *Lawrence Galton.* Nation's Bus. Mar. 1947.

———. World bank and world trade. *Alzada Comstock.* Current Hist. Mar., 1947.

———. If we really want international trade. *C. Hartley Grattan.* Harper's. Apr., 1947.

Military Government. Military government; administration of occupied territory. *Eberhard P. Deutsch.* Am. Bar. Assoc. Jour. Feb., 1947.

Peace Problems. Evaluating the Potsdam plan. *F. A. Hermans.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Jan., 1947.

———. Les données actuelles du problème allemand. *René Larre.* Les réparations, base de coopération internationale. *R. Chavagner.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Feb., 1947.

———. Qui tient la Bohême tient l'Europe. *Paul Valayer.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Feb., 1947.

———. Quadripartite control in Germany. *C. P. Harvey.* Nat. Rev. Mar., 1947.

———. Germany is our peace frontier. *J. Lacey Reynolds.* Nation's Bus. Mar., 1947.

———. To keep Germany peaceful. *Patrick Welch.* Freedom & Union. Mar., 1947.

Pius XII. Pope Pius XII, apostle of world peace. *D. A. MacLean.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Jan., 1947.

Private International Law. American-Swiss private international law. *Arthur Nussbaum.* Columbia Law Rev. Mar., 1947.

Regions. Some regional economic problems of the middle east. *K. A. H. Murray.* Int. Affairs. Jan., 1947.

———. Les detroits, goulot pour la navigation et pour la politique mondiale; part II. *J. F. Kover.* Rev. Pol. et Parl. Feb., 1947.

———. Pan Americanism and internationalism. *Luis Quintanilla.* Bull. Pan Am. Union. Feb., 1947.

———. Land use in southeast Asia. *Robert L. Pendleton.* Far Eastern Survey. Feb. 12, 1947.

———. Recent steps in the organization of the inter-American system. *William Manger.* Bull. Pan Am. Union. March, 1947.

Soviet Union. Russia's foreign economic policy. *Vera Micheles Dean.* Foreign Policy Rep. Feb. 1, 1947.

———. Russia and Azerbaijan. *Christopher Sykes.* Soundings. Feb., 1947.

———. Soviet policy toward disarmament. *Marina Salvin.* Int. Conciliation. Feb., 1947.

———. What Russia says about us. *Junius B. Wood.* Nation's Bus. Mar., 1947.

———. Russia and the German state. *F. A. Voigt.* Nineteenth Cent. Mar., 1947.

———. The goal of Soviet policy. *James Burnham.* Am. Mercury. Apr., 1947.

Spain. New documents on the part played by Franco Spain in war [in Russian]. *O. Arturov.* World Economics and Politics [Russian]. Oct.–Nov., 1946.

———. Spain and the United Nations. *Edward James Schuster.* Catholic World. Mar., 1947.

UNESCO. UNESCO in Paris. *Charles S. Johnson.* Survey Graphic. Feb., 1947.

———. UNESCO faces two worlds. *Byron Dexter.* For. Affairs. Apr., 1947.

UNRRA. What has UNRRA done? *W. R. Gordon.* Fortnightly. Feb., 1947.

War Crimes. Nurnberg war crimes trial [in Russian]. *M. Gus.* World Economics and Politics. [Russian]. Oct.–Nov., 1946.

———. Judgment of the international military tribunal against major war criminals and criminal organizations. *International Military Tribunal.* Dissenting opinion of the Soviet member of the tribunal. *I. T. Nikitchenko.* Final report to the president concerning the Nurnberg war crimes trial. *Robert H. Jackson.* Temple Law Quar. Dec., 1946.

———. The Nuremberg trial and international law. *George A. Finch.* The law of the Nuremberg trial. *Quincy Wright.* Am. Jour. of Int. Law. Jan., 1947.

———. The significance of the Nurnberg trials for Germany and the world. *Karl Jaspers.* Notre Dame Lawyer. Jan., 1947.

———. The issues of the Nuremberg trial. *Herbert Wechsler.* Pol. Sci. Quar. Mar., 1947.

World Organization. The twenty-fifth year of the world court. *Manley O. Hudson.* Am. Jour. of Int. Law. Jan., 1947.

———. Strong nations or strong states? *Douglas Woodruff.* Int. Affairs. Jan., 1947.

———. Does *world* government mean *more* government? *Pearl S. Buck.* The world supreme court. *J. G. Guerrero.* United Nations World. Feb., 1947.

———. The ideology of the United Nations charter and the philosophy of peace of Immanuel Kant, 1795–1945. *Carl J. Friedrich.* Jour. of Pol. Feb., 1947.

———. Narcotics control under the UN. *Helen Howell Moorhead.* Far Eastern Survey. Mar. 12, 1947.

———. The international wheat council. *Francis A. Linville.* Dept. of State Bull. Mar. 16, 1947.

———. The international children's emergency fund. *J. J. Charnow.* Dept. of State Bull. Mar. 16, 1947.

———. Union for Europe, but not for us. *Owen J. Roberts.* Freedom & Union. Mar., 1947.

———. Housekeeping for the family of nations. *Edith Iglauer.* Harper's. Apr., 1947.

———. Europe: split or united? *Alexander Galin.* For. Affairs. Apr., 1947.

World War II. Last days in Hitler's air raid shelter. *Robert E. Work.* Pub. Opin. Quar. Winter, 1946–47.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Books and Pamphlets

Allen, Robert S., ed. Our fair city. Pp. 395. N.Y.: Vanguard. 1947.

Bloom, Vera. There's no place like Washington. Pp. 296. Garden City (N.Y.): Blue Ribbon Bks. 1944.

Hayes W. J., and *Netboy, Anthony.* The small community looks ahead. Pp. 288. N.Y.: Harcourt. 1947.

Tompkins, Dorothy C., Comp. State and local finance and taxation; a bibliography of materials published 1941–1946 [mimeographed]. Pp. 101. Berkeley: Bur. of Pub. Administration, Univ. of Cal. 1947.

Yocum, J. C., and *Whipple, J. P.*, Municipal provision of parking facilities—state laws and city projects. Pp. 122. Columbus: Ohio State Univ. 1946.

Articles

Constitutional Reform. What cities need in the constitution. *M. L. Wallerstein.* Tenn. Law Rev. Feb., 1947.

Counties. County government and constitutional revision. *M. H. Satterfield.* Tenn. Law Rev. Feb., 1947.

———. County and township government in 1945. *Clyde F. Snider* and *Neil F. Garvey.* Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. Feb., 1947.

Court Decisions. New court decisions affecting cities and villages. *R. J. Cunningham.* The Municipality. Feb., 1947.

Health. Health insurance plan of greater New York. *A. Pleydell.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Jan., 1947.

Highways. Municipal-state coöperation in the development of urban highways. *Spencer Miller.* N.J. Municipalities. Mar., 1947.

Home Rule. Municipal home rule in California: IV—sections 12 and 13 of article XI of the California constitution. *John C. Peppin.* Calif. Law Rev. Dec., 1946.

Insurance. A survey of municipal insurance practices in Michigan cities. *J. G. McKevitt.* Mich. Mun. Rev. Mar., 1947.

Labor. Local regulation of discriminatory employment practices. *Alex Elson* and *Leonard Schanfield.* Yale Law Jour. Feb., 1947.

Local Government Abroad. The British council in the field. *W. C. Atkinson.* Nineteenth Cent. Feb., 1947.

Medieval Local Government. The development of town government in twelfth century Montpellier. *A. R. Lewis.* Speculum. Jan., 1947.

Public Works. Establishing efficient public works organization. *C. J. Keller.* The Municipality. Mar., 1947.

Sewage. Keeping sewage plants fit. *L. F. Warrick* and *G. F. Bernauer.* The Municipality. Mar., 1947.

State-Local Relations. A chart for state-local relations. *Frank Bane.* Pub. Management. Feb., 1947.

Streets and Alleys. The urban street problem. *J. R. Law.* The Municipality. Jan., 1947.

———. The challenge of street lighting to the electric utilities. *E. C. Powers.* Pub. Util. Apr. 10, 1947.

Taxes. The trend of municipal tax delinquency. *F. L. Bird.* Municipal tax collections and delinquency trends in Canada. *J. A. Barclay.* Mun. Finance. Feb., 1947.

———. Debt service costs as a factor in municipal property tax requirements. *James A. Arnold, Jr.* N. J. Municipalities. Feb., 1947.

———.Property values, tax levies and rates for municipalities over 2500 population. *R. A. Whitaker.* Minn. Mun. Mar., 1947.

———. Some problems in connection with revenue bonds. *H. L. Severson.* Am. City. Mar., 1947.

Transportation. Public trustees of the Boston elevated railway. *W. S. Monahan.* Boston Univ. Law Rev. Jan., 1947.

———. Moving the masses in the city of tomorrow; parts I & II. *H. N. Oliphant.* Pub. Util. Mar. 27, Apr. 10, 1947.

Water. Mattoon, Ill., unifies water supply. *John A. Goetz* and *R. D. Wilson.* Am. City. Mar., 1947.

POLITICAL AND LEGAL PHILOSOPHY

Books and Pamphlets

Bonsal, Stephen. The cause of liberty. Pp. 240. London: Joseph. 1947.

Cater, Harold Dean (comp.). Henry Adams and his friends; a collection of his unpublished letters. Pp. 1016. Boston: Houghton. 1947.

Civic Federation, Chicago. Salary rate structure of the local governments of Chicago. Pp. 45. Chicago: Civic Federation. 1946.

Colcord, J. C. Your community; its provision for health, education, safety, and welfare; 3rd ed. Pp. 263. N.Y.: Russell Sage Found. 1947.

Ensor, R. C. K. Some reflections on Herbert Spencer's doctrine that progress is differentiation. Pp. 28. London: Oxford. 1947.

Ewing, Alfred C. The individual, the state, and world government. Pp. 322. N.Y.: Macmillan. 1947.

Feibleman, James K. The revival of realism; critical studies in contemporary philosophy. Pp. 333. Chapel Hill: Univ. of N.C. Press. 1947.

Flynn, John T. The epic of freedom [democracy]. Pp. 127. Phila.: Fireside Press. 1947.

Gardner, B. B. Man in an industrial society. Pp. 21. Chicago: Human Events. 1947.

Gathings, J. A. An introduction to political science; rev. ed. Pp. 305. Ann Arbor (Mich.): Edwards Brothers. 1946.

Gough, J. W., ed. The second treatise of civil government and a letter concerning toleration by John Locke. Pp. 165. Oxford (Eng.): B. Blackwell. 1946.

Holdsworth, William S. Essays in law and history. Pp. 318. London: Clarendon. 1947.

Johnson, Frederick E., ed. Foundations of democracy. Pp. 287. N. Y.: Harper. 1947.

Lewis, Joseph. Thomas Paine, author of the declaration of independence. Pp. 310. N. Y.: Freethought Press. 1947.

Lundberg, G. A. Can science save us? Pp. 122. N. Y.: Longmans, Green. 1947.

Mohmassani. Sobhi. The philosophy of jurisprudence in Islam [in Arabic]. Pp. 351. London: Luzac. 1946.

McKeon, Richard, ed. Introduction to Aristotle, including four complete works. Pp. 696. N. Y.: Modern Library. 1947.

Oakeshott, Michael, ed. Leviathan; or, the matter, forme, and power of a commonwealth, ecclesiasticall and civil by Thomas Hobbes. Pp. 468. Oxford (Eng.): B. Blackwell. 1946.

Ruvo, Vincenzo de. L'evoluzione sociale, nuovi principii e aspetti concreti. Pp. 333. Bari (Italy): Laterza Figli. 1946.

Saitschick, Robert. Der Staat und was mehrist, ein Buch über die Grundlagen der künftigen Gesellschaft. Pp. 316. Zurich: Rascher. 1946.

Sherwani, Haroon Khan. Studies in Muslim political thought and administration. Pp. 273. Lahore (India): Sh. M. Ashraf. 1945.

Sturzo, Luigi. Nationalism and internationalism. Pp. 316. N.Y.: Roy, 1946.

Sweezy, Paul M. The theory of capitalist development; principles of Marxian political economy. Pp. 398. London: D. Dobson. 1946.

Weiss, Paul. Nature and man. Pp. 309. N.Y.: Holt. 1947.

White, Frederick R., ed. Famous utopias of the renaissance. Pp. 250. Chicago: Packard & Co. 1946.

Wylie, Philip. An essay on morals. Pp. 220. N. Y.: Rinehart. 1947.

Ypsilon, pseud. Pattern for world revolution [communism]. Pp. 484. Chicago: Ziff-Davis. 1947.

Articles

Bentham. Jeremy Bentham as an economist. *W. Stark.* Econ. Jour. Dec., 1946.

Bolshevism. Bolshevism and Stalinism. *Paul Mattick.* Politics. Mar.–Apr., 1947.

British Ideas. English reform ideas during the French revolution. *Carl B. Cone.* Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar. Mar., 1947.

Community. Economic, political, and moral communities in the world society. *Richard McKeon.* Ethics. Jan., 1947.

Democracy. Democracy in the American tradition. *T. S. Harding.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Jan., 1947.

Henry George. Henry George and Karl Marx. *J. H. Holmes.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Jan., 1947.

Aldous Huxley. Aldous Huxley and the mystics. *Norman Nicholson.* Fortnightly. Feb., 1947.

Individual Development. Philosophy of individual development. *G. W. Esty.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Jan., 1947.

Jefferson. Some notes on public administration and administrative law by Thomas Jefferson. *James Hart.* Jour. of Pol. Feb., 1947.

Jurisprudence. The case for a jurisprudence of welfare. *A. H. Pekelis.* Lawyers Guild Rev. Dec., 1946.

Ludwig Knapp. Ludwig Knapp; a forerunner of Hans Kelsen. *Anton-Hermann Chroust.* Boston Univ. Law Rev. Nov., 1946.

Liberalism. Liberalism and individual liberty. *A. Mitchell.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Jan., 1947.

Natural Law. The higher law; reaction has permeated our legal thinking. *H. R. McKinnon.* Am. Bar Assoc. Jour. Feb., 1947.

———. Conflict or compromise. *C. G. Hope.* Nineteenth Cent. Feb., 1947.

Francis Neilson. Crusader for justice. *W. Lissner.* Francis Neilson, an appreciation. *J. Hervey.* Am. Jour. of Econ. & Sociol. Jan., 1947.

Philosophy of History. Wilhelm Dilthey and Max Weber; an empirical approach to historical synthesis. *Arnold Bergstraesser.* Ethics. Jan., 1947.

———. On the intellectual crisis of our time. *Nathan Rotenstreich.* Ethics. Jan., 1947.

———. Declining values in civilization. *Lewis Einstein.* Fortnightly. Feb., 1947.

———. Encounters between civilizations. *Arnold J. Toynbee.* Harper's. Apr., 1947.

Sex and Society. The books of Wilhelm Reich. *Ethel Goldwater.* Politics. Mar.–Apr., 1947.

Status. Status as a political motive. *Sebastian de Grazia.* Jour. of Liberal Religion. Winter, 1947.

MISCELLANEOUS

Books and Pamphlets

Cicognani, Amleto Giovanni, ed. Canon law; 2nd, rev. ed. Pp. 906. Westminster (Md.): Newman Bkshop. 1947.

Clough, Shepard B., and Cole, C. W. Economic history of Europe; rev. ed. Pp. 904. Boston: Heath. 1946.

Dreiser, Theodore. An American tragedy; 2 v. in 1. Pp. 856. Cleveland: World Pub. Co. 1947.

Dunham, Barrows. Man against myth. Pp. 320. Boston: Little, Brown. 1947.

Gemmill, P. F., and *Blodgett, Ralph H.* Current economic problems, 3rd ed. Pp. 768. N.Y.: Harper. 1947.

Gibb, Hamilton, A. R. Modern trends in Islam. Pp. 154. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press. 1947.

Raymond, Fred. The limitist [small farms and small business]. Pp. 166. N.Y.: Norton. 1947.

Upson, Lent D. Organized citizen concern with government. Pp. 31. N.Y.: Governmental Research Assoc. 1946.

Articles

Business Thinking. A plan for the study of business thinking. *T. C. Cochran.* Pol. Sci. Quar. Mar., 1947.

Comparative Law Institutes. On institutes for comparative law. *Ernst Rabel.* Columbia Law Rev. Mar., 1947.

Economist and State. The economist and the state. *E. A. Goldenweiser.* Am. Econ. Rev. Mar., 1947.

Jewish History. On Baer and his philosophy of Jewish history. *Isaiah Sonne.* Jewish Soc. Studies. Jan., 1947.

Methodology. Hugo Grotius and the social sciences. *Albert Salomon.* Pol. Sci. Quar. Mar., 1947.

Sociological Concepts. The sociology of right and wrong. *Thomas H. Grafton.* Am. Sociol. Rev. Feb., 1947.

———. A conceptual scheme for the study of social organization. *G. C. Homans.* Am. Sociol. Rev. Feb., 1947.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

MILES O. PRICE
Law Library, Columbia University

AMERICAN

UNITED STATES

Civil Service Commission

Classification act. Reference manual of decisions of comptroller-general on classification act of 1923, as amended (revised pages). Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1946. 75 p. 20¢.

Commerce Department

Census bureau. City finances: 1945. Portland (Ore.) City government finances in 1945. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1947. p. 325–336. (processed). (Vol. 1, no. 1.) (There will be 37 of these reports; fifteen have been issued through March, 1947, covering cities of 250,000 population or over.)

——— Government employment: Public employment in April, 1946. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., Feb., 1947. 7 p. (Government employment, vol. 7, no. 2—final.)

——— Population: Employment characteristics of families in the United States, Feb., 1946. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1947. 6 p. (processed).

——— Estimated population of the United States, by age, color, and sex: 1940 to 1946. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1947. 8 p. (processed).

——— Recent trends in population replacement. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1947. 6 p. (processed).

Congress

House of representatives. Veterans. Manual explanatory of privileges, rights, and benefits provided for persons who served in armed forces of United States during World War I, World War II, or peacetime, and those dependent upon them . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1947. 25 p. (H. doc. 772, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) 40¢.

——— *Campaign expenditures, Special committee to investigate.* Report . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1947. 51 p. (H. rp. 2739, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

——— Hearings, 79th Cong., 2d sess., on H. Res. 645. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1946. 7 parts. (These include investigations of the National citizens political action committee, CIP political action committee, American federation of labor, National association of manufacturers, American action, Inc., Brotherhood of railroad trainmen, International brotherhood of teamsters, American federation of musicians, United garment workers.)

——— *Pensions committee.* Veterans. Summary of rights and privileges of veterans and dependents of veterans of Spanish-American War, Philippine insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion, Dec. 1, 1946. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1947. 43 p. 10¢.

——— *Postwar economic policy and planning, Special committee on.* Economic policy. Postwar economic policy and planning, hearings, 79th Cong., 1st and 2d sess., pursuant to H. Res. 60. Washington: Govt Ptg. Off., 1947. Pts. 8 and 9. (Financial problems of transitional period. 2375–2520 p. 30¢. Export of information media, both government and private . . . 2521–2634 p. 25¢.)

——— *Public lands committee.* Study of problems in connection with public lands of United States, tax problems connected with acquisition of such lands, and burden upon local units by reason of use of large tracts of public lands for public use, etc., report pursuant to H. Res. 96, 79th Cong. . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1947. 21 p.

——— *Un-American activities commmittee.* Investigation of un-American propaganda activities in United States, hearings, 79th Cong., 2d sess., on H. Res. 5, Nov. 22, 1946. (Testimony of Louis F. Budenz concerning activities of Communist party.) Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1946. 73 p. 15¢.

——— Same, revised hearings. 1947. 75 p. 20¢.

Library of Congress

Postwar problems; a current list of United States government publications, Oct.–Dec., 1945. Comp. by Kathrine Oliver Murra with the collaboration of librarians of the federal agencies. Washington, 1947. 271 p. (Furnished only to libraries on request.)

Navy Department

Naval operations office. World War, 1939–45. U. S. Navy at war, 1941–45, official reports to Secretary of Navy; by Ernest J. King. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1946. 305 p. $4.00.

Office of Price Administration

Price administration committee, 1941–42. Minutes . . . Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1947. 65 p. (Historical reports on war administration, O.P.A., Miscellaneous publication no. 2.)

President of the United States

Budget bureau. War program. United States at war, development and administration of war program by federal government; prepared under auspices of committee of records of war administration by war records section. Washington: Govt. Ptg. Off., 1946. 555 p. $1.00. (Historical reports on war administration 1.)

State Department

Organization manual. Washington, 1947. ("This Organization Manual describes the present organizational structure of the Department and sets forth the present

functional assignments to component parts. It constitutes the basic operating directive of the Department . . . ." This processed publication, of some 400 unnumbered pages, sets forth all the official regulations governing the organization of the Department.)

The following in the numbered series of State department publications have appeared; all from the Government Printing Office, 1946–47.

2650. Double taxation, taxes on income: convention between the United States of America and the United Kingdom . . . 16 p. 10¢

2652. The Inter-American system: Arrangements between the United States of America and other American republics, embodied in Resolution IX of the final act of the Inter-American conference on problems of war and peace—Signed at Mexico City, Mar. 8, 1945. 15 p. 10¢.

2655. Report to Congress on foreign surplus disposal, Oct., 1946. 59 p. 15¢.

2665. Participation of the United States government in international conferences, July 1, 1941–June 30, 1945. Conference series 89. 232 p. 45¢.

2672. Products on which possible tariff concessions will be considered in reciprocal trade agreement negotiations. Commercial policy series 96. 82 p. Free.

2677. United Nations food and agriculture organization: Constitution adopted by the United States of America and other governments—Signed at Quebec, Oct. 16, 1945. Treaties and other international acts series 1554. 15 p. 10¢.

2679. Act of Chapultepec . . . Treaties and other international acts series 1543. 14 p. 10¢.

2683. North American regional broadcasting: Interim agreement between the United States of America and other governments—Signed at Washington, Feb. 25, 1946 . . . Treaties and other international acts series 1553. 25 p. 10¢.

2684. Declaration regarding Germany by the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the provisional government of the French Republic. Signed at Berlin June 5, 1945 . . . 25 p. 10¢.

2699. International agencies in which the United States participates. 322 p. 65¢. (Describes origin and development, membership, purposes, powers and functions; structure, finances, United States relations, relations with other international organizations, present statutes, and basic texts and publications concerning.)

2704. Legislation, regulations, and orders pertaining to foreign surplus disposal, Dec., 1946. 58 p. Free.

2712. General relations: Treaty between the United States of America and the Philippines . . . Treaties and other international acts series 1568. 8 p. 5¢.

2724. The treaty of Versailles and after, Annotations of the text of the treaty. Conference series 92. 1018 p. Not available for public purchase. See 2757. ("No treaty in history has produced so much comment, has been so freely criticized, and possibly so little read and understood . . . ." The annotations were prepared by Denys P. Myers, and Bernadotte E. Schmitt collaborated in their final editing.)

2726. United States National committion for UNESCO: Report on the first meeting. Sept., 1946. 41 p. 25¢.

2728. Preliminary draft charter for the International trade organization of the United Nations. 68 p. 20¢.

2737. International control of atomic energy: the first report of the United Nations atomic energy commission to the Security council, December 31, 1946. 101 p. 25¢.

2743. Treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, Roumania, and Finland (English versions). European series 21. 252 p. $1.00.

2747. Third session of the Council of foreign ministers. New York City, November 4 to December 12, 1946. 13 p. Free.
2752. The problem of the Turkish Straits. Near Eastern series. 68 p. 30¢.
2756. Preliminary proposals for an international trade organization. 24 p. 15¢.
2758. The American trade program: What do we have at stake? By Clair Wilcox. 24 p. 15¢.
2757. The treaty of Versailles and after: Annotations of the text of the treaty. Papers relating to the foreign relations of the United States: The Paris peace conference, 1919. Vol. XIII. 1018 p. $3.25.
2777. Regulation and reduction of armaments. Action of the General assembly. 33 p. 10¢.
2785. Recommendations on Greece and Turkey. The president's message to the Congress. Mar. 12, 1947. 11 p. Free.
2787. The international children's emergency fund. 6 p. 5¢.
2789. Peace, freedom, and world trade. Address by the President. 14 p. 5¢.
2796. Report of the South Seas conference. 7 p. 10¢.
——— *Office of public affairs.* Greece: a summary of background information. Washington, Mar., 1947. 11 p. (mim.)

War Department

U. S. Army military government in Korea, Headquarters, Foreign affairs section. Repatriation from 25 September 1945 to 31 December 1945. Prepared by Captain William J. Gane. 97, 66 p. maps.
Office of military government for Germany. Status report on military government of Germany, United States zone. 1946. 46 p. maps (processed).

STATE AND TERRITORIAL

ALABAMA

University. Bureau of public administration. The units of government in Alabama. University, 1946. 34 p. Free.

CALIFORNIA

Department of employment. Research and information section. California employment and payrolls in 1944 . . . classified by industry and county. Sacramento, 1946. 36 p. (Report 127 #7.)

CONNECTICUT

Legislative council. Report, Nov. 20, 1946. Hartford, 1946. 108 p. (Pub. doc. 96.)

INDIANA

Office of the state superintendent of public instruction. The study of politics for Indiana schools. Indianapolis, 1947. 111 p. (mim.) (Bulletin no. 185.)

KANSAS

Legislative council. Research department. State regulation of alcoholic beverages: constitutional provision and state summaries. Topeka, 1947. 17 p. (mim.)
University of Kansas, Lawrence. Bureau of business research—Bureau of government research. Fiscal Kansas. J. D. Morgan, comp. Lawrence, 1947. 99 p.

MARYLAND

Land office and prerogative court records of colonial Maryland, by Elisabeth Hartsook and Gust Skordas . . . Annapolis, 1946. 124 p. (Publications of the Hall of Records commission no. 4.)

MICHIGAN

Governor. A report to the Michigan legislature, 1943–1946. Lansing, 1946. 125 p.

NEBRASKA

Legislative council. Report of the Nebraska legislative council sub-committee on realignment of legislative committees . . . Lincoln, 1946. 12 p. (mim.)

——— Report of the Nebraska legislative sub-committee on reports of state departments . . . Lincoln, 1946. 9 p. (mim.)

——— Report of the Nebraska legislative council sub-committee on taxation . . . Lincoln, 1946. 55 p. (mim.)

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Planning and development commission. Long range financial programs for municipalities, a sound municipal procedure. Information prepared by William Stanley Parker . . . Concord, 1946. 8 p., charts, tables.

——— Property tax mapping, a profitable municipal procedure . . . Concord, 1946. 8 p.

NEW YORK

Department of audit and control. A preview of local government, 1945–1955. (Addresses at conferences to discuss municipal services and finances.) Albany, 1945, 299 p.

Department of civil service. Salary standardization board. Survey report. Albany 1, N. Y. 1947. 301 p. $1.50.

Department of commerce. Local planning and zoning, a manual of powers and procedures for citizens and government officials. Albany, 1946. 67 p.

OHIO

Cincinnati. City planning commission. The economy of the Cincinnati metropolitan area. Cincinnati, 1946. 126 p. $2.50.

OREGON

University of Oregon, Eugene. Bureau of municipal research and service. Comparative property tax rates in Oregon cities, 1946–47 . . . Eugene, 1946. 11 p. (mim.)

——— Occupation and amusement taxes and fees in Oregon cities . . . Eugene, 1946. 29 p. (mim.)

SOUTH CAROLINA

University of South Carolina, Columbia, Bureau of public administration. The merit system in state and local government. Columbia, 1947. 15 p. (mim.) (1947 series on legislative problems, no. 3.)

TENNESSEE

State planning commission. Tennessee state government, a hundred million dollar business. A report on state finances, 1945–1946. Nashville, 1946. 38 p. charts.

VIRGINIA

University of Virginia, University. Bureau of public administration. The administration of liquor control in Virginia, by H. Wesley Ward. Charlottesville, 1946. 206 p. (mim.) map, charts, table.

FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL

ARAB OFFICE

An introduction to the past and present of the kingdom of Iraq. 1946. 118 p.

ARGENTINA

Ministerio del interior. Subsecretaria de informaciones. La política internacional de la nacion Argentina. Absoluta identidad de su tradición y sus principios con los sustentados en el Acta de Chapultepec, la declaración de Mexico, la declaración de las Naciones Unidas y la Carta del Atlántico, por Carlos Alberto Silva. Buenos Aires, Imp. de la Cámara de Diputados, 1946. 991 p. (This is an elaborate, documented, and indexed exposition of the history, system of laws, and diplomacy of the Argentine Republic.)

Presidencia. Secretaria técnica. Plan de gobierno, 1947–1951 . . . Buenos Aires, 1946. 2 v. maps.

BULGARIA

Ministry of information and arts. The draft constitution of the People's Republic of Bulgaria. Sofia, 1946. 30 p.

CHILE

Archivo nacional. El Archivo nacional; antecedentes de su fundación y resena de la labor realizada desde 1927 a 1945. Santiago de Chile, 1946. 172 p.

Direccion general del registro electoral. Elleción extraordinaria general de Presidente de la República en 4 de septiembre de 1946; resumen estadístico de la población electoral de la república, clasificada por departamentos, comunas y circunscripciones civiles . . . al lo de julio de 1946. Santiago de Chile, Universo, 1946. 14 p.

COLOMBIA

Banco de la República. Medidas sobre control y administración de bienes de extranjeros, 1941–1945 . . . por Dr. Pedro A. Gomez Naranjo . . . Bogotá, Imp. del Banco de la Republica, 1945. 162 p.

Corte suprema de justicia. Juzgamiento por consejos de guerra verbales, los poderes presidenciales durante el estado de sitio, sentencia de la Corte . . . Bogotá, Imp. nacional, 1945. 129 p.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Ministerstvo Unitra. Odbro pro politicke zpravodajstvi. Lidice. Cin krvaveho teroru a poruseni zakonu i zakladnich Lidskych prav. Praha, 1946. 122, 30 p. plates.

ECUADOR

Universidad de Guayaquil. El imperialismo y la democracia a través de la Doctrina Monroe, por Teodoro Alvarado Garaicoa. Guayaquil, 1946. 80 p. (Publicaciones. Ciencias jurídicas no. 5.)

FRANCE

Ministère des affaires étrangères. Négociations Franco-Américaines relatives à la politique économique internationale. Paris, Imp. Nationale, 1946. 63 p.

GREAT BRITAIN

Terms of League of nations mandates. Textes des mandats de la Société des nations. Lond.: H. M. Stationery Office, 1947. 135. 5/.

Attorney-general. Trial of German major war criminals: by the International military tribunal sitting at Nuremberg, Germany . . . Lond.: H. M. S. O., 1946. 173 p. 2/6.

Foreign office. Proposals for the future of Palestine. Lond.: H. M. S. O., 1947. 14 p. (Cmd. 7044.) /4.

MEXICO

Contruyeno Mexico, 1910–1946. Mexico, Talleres gráficos de la nación, 1946. 165 p.

PANAMA

Constitución de la República de Panamá. Ed. oficial. Panamá, 1946. 81 p.

Congreso. Proyecto de constitución nacional y exposición de motivos presentados al gobierno por la Comisión nombrada por el decreto no. 1056 del lo de noviembre de 1944 . . . Panamá, Comp. editora nacional, s.a., 1945. 114 p.

SPAIN

Public prosecutor's office. The general cause (causa general): the Red domination in Spain. Preliminary information drawn up by the public prosecutor's office. Madrid, 1946. 365 p. annexes, plates.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Union of South Africa Government information office. South West Africa and the Union of South Africa: The history of a mandate. New York, 500 Fifth Avenue, (1947?), 108 p. illus.

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Ministerstva inostrannic del. Documenty Ministerstva inostrannykh del Germanii. Ogis, 1946. 3 v.

TURKEY

Turkish information office. Convention regarding the régime of the Straits, signed at Montreux, July 20, 1936. Washington, 2326 California St., N.W., 1946. 13 p. (mim.)

YUGOSLAVIA

Memorandum of the government of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia on the economic problem of Trieste, n.p., n.d. 16 p.

Annex to the memorandum . . . n.p., n.d. 29 maps and plates.

Donées statistiques sur la structure ethnique de la Marche Julienne. n.p., 1946. 33 p.

Maps relating to the ethnical structure of the Julian March. n.p., n.d. Introductory note and maps.

The trial of Dragoljub-Draza Mihailovic. Stenographic record and documents from the trial of . . . Mihailovic. Belgrade, 1946. 552 p.

Yugoslav Embassy Information office, London. The treason of Mihailovitch. 81 documents. London, 1945. 71 p. plates. (All the above elaborate documents are distributed by the Yugoslav Embassy, Washington, D. C.)

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Treaty series; publication of treaties and international engagements registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations, vol. 205, 1944–1946. Lausanne, Switzerland, 1946. 220 p. (This is the last volume of the series. The United Nations will continue the registration and publication of treaties, in some form. See Resolution of the General Assembly, Dec. 14, 1946.)

PAN AMERICAN UNION

Latin American treaty developments, 1944. Washington, Pan American Union, 1947. 63 p. (mim.) (Law and treaty series no. 21.) (This is a detailed statement to accompany the "Status of the Pan American treaties and conventions, revised to January 1, 1947—which is a part of this publication. Such a list is issued each January and July, but this is the first publication of the other information, as up to this time (i.e., 1938 to 1943 inclusive) such a compilation has appeared annually in the Handbook of Latin American Studies. However, that has been discontinued, and it is planned by the Pan American Union to continue the publication listed above, annually from now on.)

UNITED NATIONS

Agreement between the United Nations and the Food and agriculture organization of the United Nations. Lake Success, N. Y., 1947. 23 p. (Text in English and French.)

Agreement between the United Nations and the International labour organization. Lake Success, N. Y., 1947. 20 p. (Text in English and French.)

Agreement between the United Nations and the United Nations Educational, scientific, and cultural organization. Lake Success, 1947. 24 p. (Text in English and French.)

Advisory group of experts on administrative personnel and budgetary questions. Report . . . to the Secretary-general of the United Nations. Lake Success, N. Y., 1946. 28 p.

Atomic energy commission. Official records. Special supplement: Report to the Security Council. Lake Success, N. Y., 1946. 141 p. (French and English text in parallel columns.)

Food and agriculture organization for Greece. Report of the FAO mission for Greece. Washington, Mar., 1947. 188 p. maps.

Inter-allied reparation agency. First report of the secretary-general for the year 1946. 69 p.

Intergovernmental committee on refugees. Preparatory documents concerning the adoption of an identity and travel document for refugees coming within the mandate of the intergovernmental committee. Geneva, Switzerland, 1946, 157 p., folders, charts.

Preparatory committee of the United Nations conference on trade and employment. Report of the first session. London, Oct., 1946, 67 p., 25¢.

United Nation's Educational, scientific, and cultural organisation. Conference for the establishment of . . . London, Preparatory commission UNESCO, 1946. 155 p. 4/.

United Nations educational, scientific, and cultural organization. General conference, 1st, Paris, 1946. Journal . . . Nov., 1946—13/16 Dec., 1946. 22 numbers. (Text in parallel columns, in French and English.)

World health organization. Interim commission. A fact book. New York, 1947. 15 p. (mim.)

NOTES ON SOME RECENT DOCUMENTARY MATERIALS

JAMES B. CHILDS
Library of Congress

The constitution of the French Republic as approved by popular vote on October 13, 1946, and promulgated by Georges Bidault, president of the Provisional Government, on October 27, was printed in the *Journal officiel de la République Française*, pp. 9166–9175, and is conveniently and inexpensively available at the Imprimerie des Journaux Officiels, Paris, in a pamphlet of 24 pages, same format, as no. 427 of the *Extraits du Journal officiel*, under the title *Constitution de la Republique Française* . . . . Also included in this pamphlet are the laws of October, 1946, relative to the Conseil de la République, the Conseil Économique, the Assemblée de l'Union Française, the Haute Cour de Justice, and the election of members of the Assemblée Nationale. The constitution and the related laws are also to be found conveniently in the octavo volume (495 pp.) entitled *Recueil des lois adoptées par l'Assemblée Nationale Constituante élue le 2 juin 1946 et promulguées du 12 juillet 1946 au 30 octobre 1946*. As voted on September 28, 1946, by the second Assemblée Nationale Constituante, the constitution was first printed in an octavo pamphlet of 36 pages of the slip law series *Proposition de loi adoptée*.

Proceedings of the committee drafting the constitution were printed in a compact octavo volume of 808 pages at the Imprimerie de l'Assemblée Nationale Constituante under the title *Séances de la Commission de la Constitution: Comptes rendus analytiques, imprimés en exécution de la résolution votée par l'Assemblée le 2 octobre 1946*. M. André Philip was the committee chairman. Forty-eight sessions from June 20 through October 3 were held by this large committee of forty-two members. Debates seem to have been reported in full. The present volume, together with the corresponding one for the first Assemblée Nationale Constituante, forms the full official record of the special problems involved in the drafting of the French constitution, and deserves to be more widely known.

Not until 1946 did the familiar blue paper-covered permanent edition appear of the debates of the French Chamber of Deputies for the sessions of 1940 from January 9 to July 9 in a single volume of 832 pages printed at the Imprimerie des Journeaux Officiels and having the title *Annales de la Chambre des Députés, 16e législature: Débats parlementaires, sessions ordinaire et extraordinaire de 1940* . . . . Included are the debates of the single session of the Assemblée Nationale on July 10, marking the close for the time being of the parliamentary régime. Originally the debates had been printed from day to day as special supplements of the *Journal officiel*.

The appearance also in 1946 of the author volume (lxxx, 559 pp.) of the index to the documents of the French Senate and Chamber of Deputies in the 16th Legislature, 1936–40, gives evidence of the considerable mass of currently printed documents in addition to the *Annales parlementaires* that would seem to be desirable for a full understanding of the French legislative process during this important period. The title of the index is *Table alphabétique (nominative et méthodique) des impressions du Sénat et de la Chambre des Députés pour la seizième législature (du 1er juin 1936 au 31 mai 1942)*, and oddly enough it has the imprint "Imprimerie de la Chambre des Députés." According to the preface of this first volume, the full official collection of the currently printed documents for the period amounts to a hundred volumes. For the Senate, the following series may be mentioned: *Feuilletons; Amendments; Pétitions; Bulletin des commissions; Projets et propositions de loi et résolutions adoptés;* and *Projets, propositions de loi, et rapports d'intérêt général.*

For the Chamber of Deputies, the following may be mentioned: *Feuilletons; Amendments; Pétitions; Bulletin des commissions; Projets et propositions de loi et résolutions adoptés; Projets de loi et rapports d'intérêt local;* and *Projets et propositions de loi et rapports d'intérêt général.*

Draft of the proposed constitution of the republic of Italy as approved by the Commissione per la Costituzione was presented to the presidency of the Assemblea Costituante on January 31, 1947, as a pamphlet of 36 pages (8×11 in.) printed by the Tipografia della Camera dei Deputati under the title *Progetto di costituzione della Repubblica Italiana.*

The Commissione per la Costituzione of the Constituent Assembly, which held its first plenary session on July 20, 1946, organized with three subcommittees. Rights and duties of the citizen formed the assignment of the first sottocommissione of 16 members. Constitutional organization of the state constituted the assignment of the second sottocommissione of 36 members. Economic and social affairs were alloted to the third sottocommissione of 16 members. On July 26, the subcommittees began to sit. Proceedings of the plenary sessions of the committee, as well as of the subcommittees, were printed in separate series (8×11 in.), each having the title *Resoconto sommario,* issued from day to day in signatures. Publication in volume form of the materials of the Constitutional Committee has been started under the title *Atti della Commissione per la Costituzione.* Vol. 1 (270 pp.) of the *Atti* is composed of "studi di legislazione costituzionale comparata," and vol. 2 of "relazione e proposte," being drafts and reports presented in subcommittee. Subsequent volumes are to include the "verbali" of the committee and of the subcommittees already printed and distributed from day to day.

As a basis for the constitution-drafting, the Constitutional Committee had the benefit of the documents prepared by the Ministero per la Costituente, created by decree 435, July 31, 1945. This ministry functioned through three committees: Commissione Economica Commissione per Studi Attinenti alla Riorganizzazione dello Stato, and Commissione per lo Studio dei Problemi del Lavoro. Work of the Economic Committee was initiated on October 29, and of the Committee on the Organization of the State on November 21. Hearings, studies, and reports of the Economic Commission were printed at the Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, Rome, 1946, in a series of volumes entitled *Rapporto della Commissione Economica all'Assemblea Costituente,* covering agriculture, industry, monetary problems and foreign trade, credit and insurance, and finance. Hearings, studies, and reports from the Commission on the Reorganization of the State were printed at the Stabilimento Tipografico Fausto Failli, Rome, 1946, under the title *Relazione all'Assemblea Costituente,* vol. 1 being devoted to constitutional problems and organization of the state, vol. 2 to local autonomy, regional problems and local administration, and vol. 3 to public corporations and to sanitary organization. Hearings, studies and reports of the Labor Commission were printed at the Stab. Tip. U.E.S.I.S.A., Rome, 1946, 3 volumes, entitled *Atti della Commissione per lo Studio dei Problemi del Lavoro.* The Ministero per la Costituente was abolished by decree 54, August 2, 1946.

For the Assemblea Costituente itself, which first met on June 25, 1946, the debates are reported from day to day in separate numbers of "atti parlamentari" (8×11 in. page). At the first session, when the provisional president took his seat, the spontaneous expression was "Viva la Repubblica! Viva l'Italia!" On the third day (June 28), Enrico De Nicola was elected as "capo provisorio dello stato." On the eighth day (July 19), the Constitutional Committee and the Committee on Treaties were constituted.

The legislative decree of March 10, 1946, providing for the election of members of the Constituent Assembly was printed as a 24-page supplement to the *Gazzetta Ufficiale*, March 12, having the title *Norme per l'elezione dei deputati all'Assemblea Costituente*. Lists of the candidates of each of the eleven parties for membership in the Assembly were printed as a supplement to the *Gazetta Ufficiale*, May 20, 1946. The slate of the Partito Communista Italiano was the first listed, and that of the Blocco Nazionale della Liberta the last.

The Consulta Nazionale, the advisory legislative body preceding the Constituent Assembly, began its sessions on September 25, 1945, and in the words of the President of the Council of Ministers, "Questa riunione, in quest'aula, solennemente chiude il ciclo della lunga e dolorosa crisi che il fascismo ha introdotto nella storia d'Italia e da quest'aula ha preso inizio." *Atti* (debates) of the Consulta Nazionale were printed from day to day in separate fascicules at the Tipografia della Camera dei Deputati, and seemed to be concerned in considerable part with discussion of a draft "Legge elettorale politica per l'Assemblea Costituente." Legislative bills, reports, etc., were printed in a parallel series as *Documenti*, no. 56 being the draft electoral law. Proceedings of the various committees (Affari Esteri, Affari Politici e Amministrativi, Industria e Commercio, Ciustizia, etc.) as well as joint sessions were each printed from day to day in separate series, having the common title *Resoconto sommario*.

Under the date June 20, 1946 (no. 134), the Italian official gazette containing the definite report of the Corte Suprema di Cassazione on the referendum concerning the form of the Government appeared for the first time with the title *Gazzetta Ufficiale della Repubblica Italiana*, the last previous issue having been no. 133 for June 10, under the title *Gazzetta Ufficiale del Regno d'Italia*.

Basic documents for understanding the reëstablishment of state government in the United States zone in Germany are contained in the 74-page compilation of the Office of Military Government for Germany (U.S.), Berlin, as of February 15, 1947, under the title *Constitutions of Bavaria, Hesse, and Wuerttemberg-Baden*. The work was prepared by the Civil Administration Division of the Office of Military Government and contains the texts of the three constitutions in English and German in parallel columns, with a brief introduction. Constituent assemblies in each of the three states began work on July 15, 1946, and deliberated for about two and a half months. The constitution of Wuerttemberg-Baden was approved by popular vote on November 24, 1945, and those of Hesse and Bavaria on December 1.

For the period June 1–November 30, 1946, when the constituent assemblies deliberated, the orders of the Office of Military Government for Germany (U.S.) are printed in the 16-page issue B of the *Military government gazette, Germany, United States zone—Amtsblatt der Militarregierung, Deutschland, Amerikanische Zone*, dated December 1, 1946.

For the International Zone of Morocco at Tangiers, the resumption of the government was marked by issue no 278 of the semi-monthly *Bulletin officiel*, dated November 15, 1945. In this number is contained the Dahir (enactment) of September 22, 1945, dealing with the organization of the Zone administration as of October 11, 1945, placing in effect again the Dahir of February 16, 1924, providing for a Consular Committee of Control, an international Legislative Assembly, and an Administrator (of Belgian, Dutch, Portuguese, or Swedish nationality), chosen by the Committee of Control. By the Dahir of September 22, 1945, all decrees, laws, and regulations between June 13, 1940, and October 11, 1945, during the period of Spanish control, were declared null and void so far as contrary to the acts and conventions forming

the constitution of the Zone. This *Bulletin officiel*, which is also issued in separate Arabic and Spanish editions as well as in French, includes enactments and administrative decrees, legal and judicial notices, and periodic social and economic statistics. No. 277, the last previous issue, is dated December 31, 1940. Supplementing the *Bulletin officiel* is the *Bulletin officiel spécial du Service de la Protection de la Propriété Industrielle* for patent registration, printed likewise in separate French, Spanish, and Arabic editions.

An indication of growing appreciation in Europe of public documents as source materials in understanding the activity of the state is marked by the Schweizerische Landesbibliothek (Swiss National Library) at Bern in inaugurating for the year 1946 an annual bibliography of Swiss official publications under the title *Bibliographie der schweizerischen Amtsdruckschriften—Bibliographie des publications officielles suisses.* The first volume (vi, 69 pp.) is arranged in four groups (Confederation, Cantons, Municipalities, and Bishoprics), and includes 418 titles, accompanied by a careful index. Periodical publications not beginning during the year are excluded. It is to be hoped that other European countries will find the bibliography so practical as to undertake similar recording.

In the extra number of the Japanese *Official gazette*, English edition, for November 16, 1946, is the text of a cabinet instruction and notification adopting for use in all government offices as of that date a standard table of Chinese characters in common use and a modern orthography for Japanese, the purpose stated being to reduce language complications and to adjust the traditional orthography of Japanese to the living language sound. The change is based on the work of the National Language Deliberation Committee. Detailed schedules are not included in the English edition of the *Official Gazette.*

Evidence of the expression of dependent native peoples in the attempt to enlist their coöperation in legislation in reference to their own problems is furnished so far as Northern Rhodesia is concerned in the *Proceedings of the first session of the [African Representative] Council, November, 1946*, a pamphlet of 90 pages printed by the Government Printer at Lusaka. The Council was constituted as a non-statutory body to advise the governor of Northern Rhodesia on matters directly affecting the African population of the colony. The secretary of Native Affairs is the presiding officer, and the 29 members are, with but one exception, representative of the various African provincial councils in Northern Rhodesia, which had with the single exception been meeting regularly for three years. In 1948, the African Representative Council is to elect two members to the Legislative Council. The debates of the first session held November 14–16 at the Jeanes School at Chalimbana are reported in full in English, a note of the language used being made when the member spoke in one of the native languages.

After a lapse of five years, the island government of American Samoa resumed publication of *O le Fa'atonu* ("The Information"), the semi-monthly island newspaper in Samoan and English, with vol. XLIII, no. 1, dated November 13, 1946. The proclamation calling the annual Fono, or General Assembly, for November 12 1946, and the address of Capt. H. A. Houser, the governor of American Samoa, to the Fono, are printed in this first number after the War.

OFFICERS OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

President
ARTHUR W. MACMAHON
Columbia University

First Vice-President
QUINCY WRIGHT
University of Chicago

Second Vice-President
V. O. KEY, JR.
Johns Hopkins University

Third Vice-President
CHARLES FAIRMAN
Stanford University

Secretary-Treasurer
KENNETH COLEGROVE
Northwestern University

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer
HARVEY WALKER
Ohio State University

Managing Editor
FREDERIC A. OGG
University of Wisconsin

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Above-named officers ex-officiis

EDWARD F. DOW
University of Maine

ROBERT J. HARRIS
Louisiana State University

JOHN G. HEINBERG
University of Missouri

WALTER H. C. LAVES
U. S. Bureau of the Budget

CHESTER C. MAXEY
Whitman College

RALPH J. BUNCHE
Howard University

ROBERT H. CONNERY
Stanford University

CHARLES MCKINLEY
Reed College

C. PERRY PATTERSON
University of Texas

HAROLD S. QUIGLEY
University of Minnesota

TAYLOR COLE
Duke University

GEORGE A. GRAHAM
Princeton University

LLEWELLYN PFANKUCHEN
University of Wisconsin

JOHN A. VIEG
Pomona College

BELLE ZELLER
Brooklyn College

FORMER PRESIDENTS

FRANK J. GOODNOW
ALBERT SHAW
FREDERIC N. JUDSON
JAMES BRYCE
A. LAWRENCE LOWELL
WOODROW WILSON
SIMEON E. BALDWIN
ALBERT BUSHNELL HART
W. W. WILLOUGHBY
JOHN BASSETT MOORE
ERNST FREUND
JESSE MACY
MUNRO SMITH
HENRY JONES FORD
PAUL S. REINSCH
LEO S. ROWE
WILLIAM A. DUNNING
HARRY A. GARFIELD
JAMES W. GARNER
CHARLES E. MERRIAM
CHARLES A. BEARD
WILLIAM B. MUNRO
JESSE S. REEVES
JOHN A. FAIRLIE
BENJAMIN F. SHAMBAUGH
EDWARD S. CORWIN
WILLIAM F. WILLOUGHBY
ISIDOR LOEB
WALTER J. SHEPARD
FRANCIS W. COKER
ARTHUR N. HOLCOMBE
THOMAS REED POWELL
CLARENCE A. DYKSTRA
CHARLES GROVE HAINES
ROBERT C. BROOKS
FREDERIC A. OGG
WILLIAM ANDERSON
ROBERT E. CUSHMAN
LEONARD D. WHITE
JOHN M. GAUS
WALTER F. DODD